ABSTRACT

THE EDUCATIONAL THEORIES OF AMERICAN SOCIALISTS 1900-1920

By

Joseleyne Slade Tien

It is the thesis of this study that from 1900 to 1920, a period when the Socialist movement in the United States reached its peak of success, a distinctively Socialist educational ideology was developed and propagated. This study is based upon an analysis of articles, book-reviews, commentaries and news items on the subject of education in Socialist journals published during this period. Journals which had a nation-wide circulation were selected for study. Books and sections of books by Socialist authors dealing with education were also consulted.

The dissertation opens with a review of the educational practices and philosophies of the nineteenth century predecessors of American Socialism. These include the communitarian Socialists, the utopian authors Laurence Gronlund and Edward Bellamy, and Karl Marx. All of these had an important impact upon the educational thought of twentieth century American Socialists.

In their writings American Socialists clearly demonstrated the vital connection between the economic condition and social status of the child and his performance in school. Socialists recommended the introduction of supportive social services, school meals, medical care, free supplies of text books and other materials to alleviate immediately the de facto

inability of the poor to benefit from the mere provision of free schools.

Within the schools, Socialists were enthusiastic advocates of the philosophies of John Dewey and the Progressive Education Association. The emphasis upon activity, experimentation and the solution of meaningful problems, in contrast to the traditional authority of teacher and prescribed subject matter, had a direct relationship to the Socialist goal of educating the masses to take control of their own politics, economics and culture. Socialists, however, generally insisted that principles of cooperation and public service needed to be taught deliberately as well as fostered indirectly by the new methodology. This was part of their aim of replacing with a new Socialist ethic the competitive, individualistic values that dominated the classrooms.

Socialists deplored the separation of industry from art, culture, and education, as a result of the Industrial Revolution. As an immediate goal, Socialists believed that industrial education should be incorporated into the curriculum of all students, and opposed the tendency for such education to become a substitute for general education and thus the vocation of a special class of people. Socialists anticipated the problem of the growth of alienation among industrial workers and, even within the confines of capitalism, sought its alleviation through the provision of spare time recreational and educational facilities. Socialists advocated completely equal educational programs for women and black people, seeing the educational problems of the latter in terms of the class struggle and minimizing the issue of race.

As to higher education, Socialists criticized the dependence of the colleges and universities upon the business establishment and its political

allies in the legislatures. Socialists called attention to the cases of dismissal of professors who were open critics of the private enterprise system, and the consequent deleterious effects upon the honest pursuit of knowledge, particularly in the social sciences. Socialists also felt that the universities effectively removed their graduates from any connection with the masses of working people, reinforcing the desire among students to achieve individual success rather than public good.

Realisation of the most basic educational goals of the Socialists depended upon a commitment to Socialist philosophy which has not been realised in the United States. Nevertheless, Socialist educational thought remains vital and relevant in the face of mounting evidence that class status remains the most significant single factor in educational failure.

THE EDUCATIONAL THEORIES OF AMERICAN SOCIALISTS 1900-1920

By

Joseleyne Slade Tien

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express particular gratitude for the guidance, sustained interest, and patient assistance given to me by Professor J.G. Moore, Chairman of my doctoral committee and my long-time mentor in educational history and thought at Michigan State University.

My thanks also go to Professor Douglas Miller for a thoughtful appraisal of this study, and to Professor Richard Featherstone and Professor George Ferree for their pertinent criticism and lively discussion of this work.

And finally, I should like to express warm appreciation to my husband, Ti, and to my children, Stephen, David, Adrienne and Jennifer whose co-operation liberated the hours needed for this non-domestic labour.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Something of the passionate commitment to Socialism that characterized the American Socialists of the early twentieth century, as well as their certainty of the inevitability of its success may be illustrated in the extract below from Max Eastman's *Address to the Jury concluding the Second Masses Trial* which took place in the fall of 1918.

> It is a faith which possesses more adherents all over the surface of the earth who acknowledge its name and subscribe to its principles, than any other faith ever had, except those private and mysterious ones that we call religious. It is either the most beautiful and courageous mistake that hundreds of millions of mankind ever made or else it is really the truth that will lead us out of our misery, and anxiety and poverty and war, and strife and hatred between classes into a free and happy world. In either case it deserves your respect.[1]

Before another year passed however the leaping flame of American Socialism had dwindled to a flicker doused by the storm of government repression that followed upon the war and the Russian Revolution and the increasingly dismembering disputes within the Socialist movement itself about the character of the new Soviet regime. But from 1900 to 1919 the fires of Socialist thought had burned brightly upon the American scene, and many illustrious names in politics, literature, philosophy, art, and education had brought kindling to the flames.

Historically, the Socialist movement, in its fervor and in its opposition to established societies, their institutions and values, invites comparison with the Puritan movement in seventeenth-century

England. Both Puritanism and Socialism, drawing upon radical doctrines to elucidate human history and nature, challenged the old order with far-reaching demands for change in government, economics, and conduct of life. Both movements called forth bitter opposition and retrenchment from those with powerful interests or attachments to the established order. Both movements rallied to their side a large and distinguished following of intellectually outstanding men and women which was clearly disproportionate to the acceptance of these ideologies in the population at large. In the case of the Puritans the central interest was spiritual, the relationship of man with the Supernatural. Their writing and thought were largely devoted to the intricacies of this essential matter. For the Socialists the key factor in human history was the economic one and the elucidation of economic relationships formed the core of their literature. However, both movements had to grapple with the problem of simultaneously having to live with the imperfections of the present while undermining it and preparing mankind for the more perfect state which was to come. Inevitably then, Puritans and Socialists were deeply concerned with education both in the broad sense of propagating their theories and in the more formal matter of working through contemporary institutions to transform them into vehicles for the transmission of their respective ideologies. Puritanism in England, though ultimately failing to gain control of government, had an enormous influence upon English character and institutions. This influence was to last for centuries, infiltrating all aspects of life, including educational philosophy and practice. The degree to which, transplanted to American and less adulterated, Puritanism succeeded in impressing its demand for a literate and devout

citizenry upon structures of American education has been well documented from the founding of Harvard and the Massachusetts Common School Law to their replicas in the Western States. As in the seventeenth century Puritanism exercised a pervasive influence in England and in America so in the twentieth century Socialist ideas have penetrated many areas of the world, and even in America Socialism, broadly defined, has a history that goes back to the first quarter of the nineteenth century and from then to 1919 a changing but steady development. From 1900, beginning with the presidential candidacy of Eugene Debs and the formation of the American Socialist Party, to 1919 nearly twenty years of vigorous political and intellectual activity marked the high tide of Socialist influence in America. Whether Socialism has been permanently eliminated as a potent force in America is uncertain at this time, but that it played a direct and significant part in the intellectual history of this country for at least the first two decades of this century is certain. What that contribution was in terms of educational philosophy and criticism thus seems worth investigating through an examination of the literature related to education.

During the period 1900 to 1919 scores of Socialist periodicals were published in the United States.[2] These included many weekly newspapers published in foreign languages, German, Italian, Yiddish, Bohemian, Swedish, Finnish, Slovakian, Lithuanian, Hungarian, and Croatian. However, the vast majority were in English and testify to the flow of Socialist thought into a regular tributary of the American stream of thought. It is impossible within the scope of this study to gain access to all the periodicals published by the Socialists

during this period from San Francisco to New York, from North Dakota to Texas. At the high point in 1912 through 1913 there were some 323 such papers though some of the small town and rural weeklies were of short duration because the animosity of businessmen and banks made their financial burdens insurmountable.[3] It was decided therefore to concentrate upon the Socialist journals which were read in all parts of the nation and which had the largest circulation over a considerable part of the period under discussion. To these magazines serious articles designed to interpret, discuss and elucidate as well as propagate Socialist ideas were contributed. As a means of gaining some insight into American responses to Socialist thought these journals have another value in that adherence to the doctrine of a proletarian "elect" made the editors particularly anxious to publish contributions by working men and women both in the form of letters and articles. Although this effort was not very successful (articles by intellectuals and professional writers forming the bulk of the Socialist journals' content) there are nevertheless a few interesting selections of opinion from working people on educational issues. Some difficulty is involved in ascertaining the political identification of a few subscribers. Not all were Socialists though just about all were fellow travellers (to borrow a later term which is useful though somewhat tarnished), serious critics of the status quo, and radical social reformers.

In order of the original date of their publication, a brief description of the journals examined, their editors, contributors, and character is given below.

The *Appeal to Reason* was a weekly journal published from 1895 to 1929. N.W. Ayers' American Newspaper Annual and Directory ascribes a circulation of 761,747 to the *Appeal* in 1913 and 529,132 in 1917-1918. According to James Weinstein[4] this circulation made the *Appeal* one of the most widely circulated newspapers in the world, and indeed it was on certain special occasions printed in editions of one million. The *Appeal* was controlled first by its founder, J.A. Wayland, until his death in 1912, next by his sons, and then by editor Louis Kopelin and E. Haldeman-Julius, another member of the editorial staff. For many years the *Appeal*'s "fighting editor" was Fred Warren. He was indicted for libel in a case which aroused Socialists because of the freedom of the press issues involved. Upon receiving an executive pardon from President Taft in 1911 which reduced his fine from $5,000 to $100, Warren refused to pay a penny sending the pardon back with a huge sticker attached, "Demand the Label on All Your Printing" because the document did not bear a union label. Published in Girard, Kansas, the *Appeal to Reason* was the most successful of the Socialist journals and was particularly influential in the farms, villages, and towns of the Mid-West where it also spawned hundreds of *Appeal* study clubs in which such materials as A.M. Simons' *American History for Workers* series and Frederick Jackson Turner's essays on frontier democracy were discussed. Charles Kerr, Socialist publisher noted in the December 1970 issue of the *International Socialist Review* that the *Appeal* had a wide audience in the Trade Union movement. He states that 550 local unions had subscribed to the *Appeal* and that the magazine was to be delivered to each of their members amounting thus to about 40,000 individual union readers.[5] If further indications of its influence are needed it should

be noted that it was the *Appeal* which in 1905 serialized Upton Sinclair's novel *The Jungle*. This book,fellow Socialist and novelist Jack London called the "*Uncle Tom's Cabin*" of wage slavery although its effect, as both writers and other Socialists noted ruefully, misfired. Among the general public, the book aroused more concern about the state of the meat than the state of the workers. Finally the *Appeal* is of great interest as a source of Socialist thought because in 1919 it retained or more accurately regained (it was among the first Socialist journals to support President Wilson's pro-allied commitment in 1917) its old revolutionary spirit when vigilantism, government suppression and internal divisions had decimated the Socialist press in the West and Mid-West. Emanating from the very heart of America the *Appeal to Reason* was thoroughly involved in the enthusiastic propagation of Socialist ideas throughout the first two decades of the twentieth century with which this study is concerned.

The *International Socialist Review* first appeared in July 1900 under the editorship of Algie Martin Simons, talented son of a poor Wisconsin farmer, graduate student of Frederick Jackson Turner, and long-time member of the National Executive Committee of the American Socialist Party. The *Review* was published by Charles H. Kerr and Company, a co-operative business located in Chicago which had specialized in bringing out first free thought, then utopian, and after 1899 Socialist literature. The *International Socialist Review* had a circulation of 42,000 in 1913, of 26,000 in 1916 and 1917 and its aim was to educate the party leadership in the principles of scientific Socialism, by introducing to its pages the most lively thought from abroad as well as from the United States. In an early editorial of November 1900, A.M. Simons wrote:

> We shall hope to secure expression of those new tendencies in science, art, literature, education and music which are known in the world of economics as socialism. . . . The movement that in literature seeks to free the mind from the control of capitalism by substituting a healthy "realism" for the corrupting productions of competition will also be represented as a correlative movement with the great economic revolt to which the name of socialism is commonly narrowed.[6]

The *Review* included a regular book review section written for many years by John Spargo; International Notes bringing news of the international Socialist movement from as far away as Japan; News of Labor; serialized novels and critical articles on a great variety of topics including education. This subject was of particular interest, along with the Women's movement, to May Wood Simons, graduate of Northwestern University, a school teacher by profession and candidate for superintendent of schools in Crawford County, Kansas. Here, from 1910 to 1913, her husband A.M. Simons managed the *Coming Nation*. This weekly magazine was a literary and artistic supplement to the *Appeal to Reason*. After 1908 the editorship of the *International Socialist Review* passed to Charles Kerr, the orientation moved further towards the left, and the cause of industrial unionism, the I.W.W. in particular received strong support. However the quality of contributions remained high. For example the Socialist poet Carl Sandburg's poems appeared, as did short stories by Jack London and articles by George Herron. The basic purpose remained educational.

The most brilliant and famous of the Socialist journals of this period was *The Masses* which began publication in January 1911 under the co-operative ownership of a group of artists and writers which included John Sloan and Louis Untermeyer. After an inauspicious beginning under the management of the Dutchman Piet Vlag whose special

interest was propagandizing the co-operative movement, and a short demise from August to December of 1912, *The Masses* was brought back to life with the election of Max Eastman as editor without pay. Eastman, a former graduate student of John Dewey at Columbia had been a member of the Socialist Party since 1912. He moved the magazine firmly towards the left and to the support of revolutionary Socialism. Nevertheless editorial policy abjured the pursuit of rigid dogma in favor of almost no-holds-barred inquiry, humor, and aesthetic concern for good writing and innovative art. A listing of the contributors to *The Masses* reads like an inventory of the "names" in American literature and art of the period. In literature there were regular contributions from Floyd Dell, William English Walling, John Reed, Louis Untermeyer, as well as occasional works by William Carlos Williams, Sherwood Anderson, Vachel Lindsay. Artists were represented by John Sloan (recently celebrated by a special postage stamp issue), Art Young and cartoonists Robert Mirror and Boardman Robinson. Unfortunately education has rarely been a subject for the undivided attention of the artist, literary or graphic, and the educational contributions were made by less eminent writers. Nevertheless the "fresh air" of irreverence and radical criticism extended to discussions of education too, as will be seen below.

In connection with *The Masses* mention should also be made of another interesting and useful Socialist journal to which frequent reference has been made, *The New Review*. It was published from 1913 to 1919 by a group which might be described as the left-wing theoreticians of American Socialism, people like Louis Boudin and Louis Fraina, but it also included articles by reform-oriented Socialists

like Charles Beard, John Spargo, and Harry Laidler. In 1919 *The New Review* merged with *The Masses*.

The study also includes the examination of books published by American Socialists during this period, works on education and philosophy, and the "larger aspects of Socialism" as William English Walling described tham.

References will also be made to authors not identified as Soccialists but whose works were recommended in reviews and articles as expressing Socialist ideals in educational theory and practice.

Substantially then the study is based on primary sources except in Chapter II in which the nineteenth century antecedents of Socialist educational ideologies are described, and in which use of secondary as well as primary sources is made.

NOTES

Chapter I

1. Max Eastman's *Address to the Jury in the Second Masses Trial* (New York: 1919), p. 18.

2. Detailed information both on the number and circulation of Socialist newspapers and periodicals may be found in Ira Kipnis *The American Socialist Movement*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), pp. 247-54); and in James Weinstein, *The Decline of Socialism in America*, 1912-1925 (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1967), pp. 82-93; and in N.W. Ayer and Son, *American Newspaper Annual*.

3. James Weinstein, *The Decline of Socialism in America*, 1912-1925 (New York and London: Monthly Review Press) p. 85.

4. Ibid., p. 85.

5. Charles Kerr, "Trade Union Support for Socialist Journals", *International Socialist Review* 8 (December 1907)343.

6. A.M. Simons, Editorial, *International Socialist Review* 1 (November 1900):318.

Chapter II

THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAS AND INFLUENCE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY COMMUNITARIAN SOCIALISTS

INTRODUCTION

Crossing the Atlantic on the Flagship *Arbella* John Winthrop addressed the new children of Israel

> "Consider that wee shall be as a Citty uppon a Hill, the eies of all people are uppon us."[1]

and Jonathan Edwards in *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New England* writes

> This new world is probably new discovered that the new and most glorious state of God's church on earth might commence there; that God in it might begin a new world in a spiritual respect.[2]

The mood, becoming more secular, the Great Seal of the United States carved out after the winning of Independence bore the motto *Novus Ordo Seclorum*.

The visionary sense of America as being a new beginning, as having a special mission to mankind is one of the most persistent themes in the consciousness of its people. Faced with the developments and social effects of the accelerating industrial revolution as well as with the disintegration of corporate religious goals two responses which are significant in the history of socialist educational theory and which are characteristically, though not exclusively, American occurred. First came the proliferation of community experiments, all in pursuit of a kingdom of heaven on earth and secondly , as the larger society overwhelmed these

examples of a better way of life, visionary programs were described in a utopian literature which profoundly influenced many people.

THE COMMUNITARIANS[3]

The communitarians may be divided into two groups--the religious, who were inspired and united by a distinctive interpretation of Christian purpose, and the secular. Of the two, the religious communities were much more successful in realizing effective community living over a long period of time. The Shakers communities, in particular, spanned a century or more of American history beginning with their organization into a community at Mount Lebanon, New York in 1787. At the pinnacle of their success, there were some fifty-eight Shaker communes with a population of over two thousand persons who together owned about 100,000 acres of land.

The success of the Shakers in gaining so many members, the peculiar qualities of their way of life and their religious practice attracted many curious visitors. Charles Dickens visited Mount Lebanon at the conclusion of his tour of American and recorded his impressions (rather dour) in his *America - Notes for Circulation.*[4] Harriet Martineau, ubiquitous observer of American society North and South was another foreign visitor to a Shaker community.[5] Of course numerous Americans were deeply interested in these experiments in their midst and commented upon them in their writings. Ralph Waldo Emerson visited the Shaker village at Canterbury, New Hampshire;[6] Nathaniel Hawthorne based stories upon the Shakers;[7] and numerous articles appeared in magazines describing various aspects of Shaker life. These are but a few examples to illustrate the interest taken

by their contemporaries in the alternative life style of the Shakers, an interest which found expression in both literary and historical writing.

To see the educational system of the Shakers in perspective it is necessary to mention some of the distinctive characteristics of their religious belief, since these affected their educational theory and practice. First, the Shakers were millennialists anticipating the imminent return of Christ and, like other Christian groups from the first century to the twentieth living with this expectation, they claimed the gift of tongues, the gift of healing, and exhibited extreme physical excitement in the ecstacy of their religious worship. More extraordinary, and potentially revolutionary in its concept, was the Shaker belief in the dual nature of God. They believed that Jesus had made manifest the masculine principle of God and that Mother Ann Lee, the founder of their sect represented the feminine side of the divine personality. The earlier appearance of the masculine element, Jesus, and the derivative Christian inspiration of the female, Ann Lee, act as a spiritual analogy paralleling the story in Genesis of the physical creation of male and female. Interestingly this understanding of the nature of the divinity led the Shakers to be very early and radical supporters of the complete equality of women. Their ministers, who were the central executive of the society, consisted, according to their rules of government, of "two brethren and two sisters", a division of executive power that has rarely been equalled in organizations with a bi-sexual membership. This division of power between men and women extended to all their activities which required management or supervision. On the other

hand it was true that certain kinds of work were regarded as more suitable for one sex than the other. The women and girls worked in the house, cooked, cleaned and did laundry for brothers while the men and boys specialized in outdoor tasks connected with farming, crafts and the maintenance of tools, although females did help with harvesting and gardening. This division affected learning procedures in that the Shakers undertook to train the children who came into the community in trades and occupations that would enable them either to work productively in the community or to earn their living if they chose to leave for the outside world.

The other Shaker principle which needs to be noted here was the belief in absolute continence for all the members of their communion. They did not believe that marriage in the outer world was a crime but that denial of the flesh, and virgin purity of behavior were basic to that state of spiritual preparedness in which they readied themselves for the millennium. Children there were however. Some came under the care of the community as their parents were admitted to full membership following the prescribed probationary period in which the seriousness of their intentions was tested. Other children were adopted in a spirit of charity, having been orphaned, abandoned, or given to the community for care by desperate impoverished parents. In the case of both groups, the Shakers, provided both in their formal education and by the provision of a small sum of money, for the survival of their children in the world outside. Meanwhile the two sexes were separated as strictly in childhood as were their elders. Elementary education, reading the Bible, calculation, and writing were taught with the boys in one room, girls in another, or, in some communities, with boys going to school in the winter and girls in the summer.

Since the Shakers not only recorded the history of their sect but also evangelized and publicized their beliefs as widely as possible, they published pamphlets and periodicals in pursuit of these aims. This literature was also encouraged reading within the communities themselves and presumed a certain level of literacy which was not inferior to that of their comtemporaries among working people outside. Central to their educational philosophy was the teaching of skills that would be useful to the community. Agriculture was the basic industry of all the Shaker societies but the communalization of tasks as well as careful management and conscientious performance provided time, encouragement, and materials for inventive activities. Not only did the Shakers become important suppliers of improved seeds, cattle, and sheep, but ingenious inventors of early household appliances and designers of furniture. Obviously the education of the boys and girls of a community in which co-operative labor was highly valued would have included an everyday apprenticeship in both the planning and practice of these diverse activities. The children of the Shakers were clearly, in the conditions of their community, able to observe, and practice a much wider variety of work activities than their counterparts in a single family, hard pressed to sustain itself in farm or workshop.

Music (hymn-singing) and art (the beautiful simplicity of their famous furniture) were by-products of the religious and practical goals of the community. All adults and children participated in the dancing which was an integral part of their worship. In

spite of the considerable prosperity that came to characterize the Shaker communities young people were not sent to educational institutions on the outside for higher education. That which the colleges of the time could have provided neither accorded with the philosophy and purposes of the Shakers nor provided any practical knowledge that they did not already possess or search for just as diligently themselves. They had no need of lawyers and their medical practice was directed primarily by a belief in the healing power of faith and secondarily through their use of herbs.

The educational practice of the Shakers then was perfectly co-ordinated with their purposes and needs. All were working members of the body of Christ and Mother Ann Lee which they constituted. Every talent and skill was exercised for the glory of God and the general good of the whole body. These ends,both body and mind were conditioned to serve and the goals were unchanging from one generation to another.

The unusual nature of their religious beliefs and mode of worship as well as their evangelism were two of the reasons that the Shakers attracted so much attention. Another reason is that, unlike the majority of religious communities, the Shakers were English speaking, and their ideology was thus more readily accessible to other Americans. However, the largest number of communitarians were German immigrants and it would be well to review briefly the philosophy and educational practice in one of these settlements. The Amana community of True Inspirationists represented a rather typical type of nineteenth century community life.

The history of the Inspirationists as a communal sect began in 1842 with immigration to America and its vestiges remain to this day in the form of a co-operative corporation in Iowa. The Inspirationists like the Shakers were one of the most successful of these communal experiments, maintaining their principles of communal living over the best part of a century.

The Inspirationists made their first settlement, Eben-Ezer, near Buffalo and economic necessity led them to hold all land, buildings and resources in common except their personal clothing and household goods. Land titles were vested in sixteen trustees and a succession of revelations from God to the religious leaders educated the membership to accept the superiority of communism for religious as well as economic reasons. The movement flourished and by the early 1850's had expanded to include nearly a thousand persons. The nearby temptations of Buffalo as well as the need for more land led the Inspirationists to seek another area for settlement. Agents sent ahead by the society purchased 26,000 acres in the Iowa River Valley, and after selling their Eben-Ezer properties without loss, the group gradually moved over the next ten year period to build seven associated villages in Iowa, not very inspirationally called North, West, Middle Amana and so on, the word Amana coming, by the way,from the mountain of that name referred to in The Song of Solomon.

The basic principle of the Inspirationist philosophy was a religious one--the saving of his soul was the only central over-riding purpose of human existence. The struggle was to subordinate all other facets of life to the achievement of this aim. Only that measure of education which contributed to this end was necessary. Any activity in school, as out of school,that might divert attention from

this goal was avoided. In Germany the children were not permitted to attend the public schools for fear that they would come under the influence of a less-single-minded clergy, so that the Inspirationists had already established a tradition of educating their own young.

The Inspirationists like the Shakers did not take an exalted view of marriage and human sexuality, regarding it as an impediment in the way of a state of grace. Unlike the Shakers however, marriage was permitted and even the "Instruments of Spiritual Inspiration", Christian Metz and Barbara Heynemann who were the religious leaders of the community indulged. Inspirationists were forbidden to marry before the age of twenty-four and the couple had to wait one year after giving notice of their intention. The marriage ceremony had a rather funereal atmosphere accompanied as it was by an automatic demotion to the status of "third-rate", reserved otherwise for children and those somewhat lacking in piety. However, promotion to one of the two higher standards of spirituality was usual for those who were really earnest about their religion. Since William Hinds mentions that there were about 500 children in the Amana community when he visited in 1876 the psychological disgrace does not seem to have had too discouraging an effect upon the ordinary human proclivity for reproduction.

In the Amana villages cooking and dining were done communally, and the labor of the village women was pooled to perform the work of preparing food for 30 to 50 people as well as a variety of other tasks which also included work of a public-service nature like nursing the aged and sick, as well as some specifically educational tasks.

Pre-school children were, at least for part of the day, cared for in groups of 20 to 25 children with 2 or 3 women in charge to free their mothers. However, since families had their own houses when they had children, communal care was obviously interspersed with the attention of the child's own parents.

Each village had a school-house and from the ages of six to thirteen children attended classes and followed a well-defined schedule of work. There were two kinds of subject matter, the three R's and manual work. From seven o'clock in the morning until nine-thirty the children did their lessons in reading, writing and arithmetic. From nine-thirty until eleven they knitted. After lunch the same routine was repeated with lessons from one to three, and knitting from three to four-thirty. Boys and girls knitted--gloves, wristlets and stockings, apparently keeping their elders and juniors well-supplied with woollies. One is not surprised to learn that woollen goods are still a specialty of the Amana area. Pedagogically the Society claimed that knitting taught the children manual dexterity, concentration, and as a familiar by-product, kept them out of mischief.

The kind of mischief that the community was particularly anxious to avoid was any kind of sexual contact. To this end the boys sat on one side of the classroom, girls on the other and the attention of both sexes was drawn frequently to rule 54 in the Catechism concerning play.

> Have no pleasure in violent games or plays; do not wait on the road to look at quarrels or fights; do not keep company with bad children, for there you will learn only wickedness. Also, DO NOT PLAY WITH CHILDREN OF THE OTHER SEX.[8]

This emphatic attempt to segregate children sexually was of course reinforced outside the school-room by a number of practices which sought to de-fuse sexual attraction. Loose long hair was forbidden, and black caps were worn by females of all ages to cover their hair. Jewelry and brooches were not allowed and clothing was dark and unrevealing. If the boys took a walk in one direction after prayer meeting then the girls by custom set off in the opposite way and males were further warned by Number XVIII of the *Rules for Daily Life* to

> Fly from the society of women-kind as much as possible, as a very highly dangerous magnet and magical pie.

Formal education then aimed at literacy so that all members might be able to read their Bibles and the spiritual experiences of the community recorded in the *Year Books of The True Inspiration Congregations: Witnesses of the Spirit of God, which happened and were spoken in the Meetings of the Society through the Instruments, Brother Christian Metz and Sister B. Landemann.* Their society ran a printing press to produce these documents of their proceedings as well as their other publications, all of a religious nature, such as *Der Kleine Kempis, oder Kurze Sprüche und Gelete* (The Little Kempis, or Short Sayings and Prayers) which was written for the use of the children. This was the literature which the Inspirationists aspired to read in their classrooms, in their meeting houses and at home.

Education then, like that of the Shakers, was directed to the two goals of spiritual salvation and economic viability. Two other significant German religious communities were the Rappites of Harmony, Indiana and Economy, Pennsylvania, and the Separatists of Zoar. Since

the Rappites voluntarily agreed to adopt celibacy in 1807 and from then on, although both sexes lived in the same house, abstained from sexual intercourse, the question of the education of children was not of major importance to them. But for those children already a part of the community the Rappites provided a good elementary education and taught every child a useful trade, the boys also learning agricultural skills. The Separatists of Zoar, on the other hand, started out as celibates, but between 1828 and 1830 in order to raise new members, decided to institute marriage in their society. Attempting to prevent a decline of the communist ethic through the growth of families, they not only built a school house, but large houses to accomodate children of three years and over in a communal setting, boys in one house and girls in another, under the care of persons other than their parents. After 1845 however, this practice was found inconvenient and the spirit of social living seemed so in decline that Charles Nordhoff, visiting the school in 1874, found an arithmetic problem concerned with the division of property among heirs, being earnestly worked upon by the pupils.

To the twentieth century student of educational philosophy the most fascinating of the millennial communitarian societies is the Oneida Community of Perfectionists. Though a religiously inspired society, the Perfectionists believed in creativity, individual self-fulfillment, and sexual happiness. They also became convinced that industrial technology was essential to the improvement of the quality of life. Moreover the Perfectionists were American both in their origin and membership, with the exception of a few immigrant Englishmen. Unlike the majority of the Shakers and the German communitarians, the Perfectionists

had a significant recruitment from the middle class, from well-educated and professional people as well as laborers, mechanics, and farmers. Their founder, John Humphrey Noyes, born in Vermont and a graduate of Dartmouth College studied theology at Andover and later in the Yale Divinity school before he developed his own dissenting theology in 1834.

At Putney, Vermont, Noyes gradually gathered a group about him who subscribed to his beliefs but living communally did not begin until 1848. The hostility of the neighbors to the sexual teachings particularly led to harassment and the community moved to Oneida in Madison County, New York. On a beginning forty acres of land, the Perfectionists established themselves, and here was to be the center of the movement, with another important establishment at Wallingford, Connecticut. For the first dozen years strict economy, hard, rough work in which all participated and an exalted sense of purpose characterized the life of the community. Gradually their perserverance, honesty and expert craftsmanship impressed their neighbors, and brought in revenues which ensured first their survival, and soon considerable prosperity. It was their decision to engage in manufacturing, particularly their fine steel traps and silverware that provided them with the margin between subsistence and a pleasant degree of material comfort. To learn the industrial techniques that were to be employed in the community workshops the Perfectionists sent men and women out into factories where these processes were already in operation. They also encouraged the inventive application of ideas and skills already present in their group and thus developed, for example, their fruit preserving business and silk-measuring machine.

The educational policies of the Perfectionists contrasted markedly with those of other religious communities though there were some common principles. But first, to capture something of the difference in spirit that distinguished this community it is necessary to describe briefly their discrete system of belief.

Unlike the Shakers and other millennialist groups who anticipated the imminent return of Christ, the Perfectionists believed that his Second Coming had already occurred within a generation of his death, namely at the time of the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Therefore all the conditions for the establishment of his everlasting kingdom were already in existence and the time was ripe for re-entry into that earthly paradise which had existed in the beginning. Thus the atmosphere pervading the group was one of joy and happiness. Sin, guilt and gloom were sloughed off as the community grew closer to God and individuals to each other. Pursuing this aim of promoting harmony and unity among those who were intent upon entering this state of perfection Noyes perceived that not only was private property a divisive element in society but even more tending towards jealousies, envies, selfishness was the right to own persons which characterized monogamous marriage. Further Noyes and his disciples believed that Christ himself was quite explicit in this regard for had he not commented that in heaven there is no giving or taking in marriage. Property in persons as in things was an attitude antagonistic both to the promotion of community and Christian perfection. John Noyes explained and disseminated among his followers both the idea of, and necessary (in a pre-contraceptive age) techniques, for amative as distinct from propagative love. Free love and joyful sexual contact between male and female members of the community were

not only encouraged but were an integral part of the Perfectionist philosophy of life. Every man was the husband of every woman in the community, each woman the wife of every man, though mutual willingness was a necessary condition for sexual intercourse. Male continence described by Noyes in *The Berean* was practiced to prevent both unplanned births and to rescue women from the burden of incessant childbirth.[9] The propagation of children was a matter for careful planning and discussion within the community, unions for procreative purposes being decided by the group with the consent of the partners. Pierrepont Noyes, a son of John Humphrey Noyes and Harriet Worden, says that his father seems to have arranged diplomatically for all the men who wanted children to father one child but that the improvement of the physical stock being a matter of concern to the community, there were males who for their qualities were most frequently selected as "stirps".[10] (Pierrepont Noyes is here referring to stirpiculture, the name John Humphrey Noyes gave to his eugenic plan.) Between 1868 and 1881 fifty-eight children were born under these provisions at the Oneida Community.

Perfectionist educational theory quite consciously held then that opportunity for the best development of the child began with pre-conceptive planning by the community in partnership with the parents. Certainly all the supportive services of the society, material and spiritual, were unstintingly available to the mother during pregnancy, childbirth, and nursing. The child was, of course, regarded as the responsibility of the whole community at birth although the mother cared for her offspring until weaning or walking. The length of this period of intimate maternal care varied according to the time of the year and the state of development of the particular child. The upbringing and

education of the children from this time on became increasingly a community concern. It was dominated by a social ideology which stressed group rather than individual loyalties, co-operation and mutual support rather than competition and self-advancement.

During the daytime the weaned infants and small children were cared for in departments of the Chidren's House according to age. Here both men and women worked in half-day shifts. During the evenings these young children returned to their mothers to spend the night. As they grew older the children spent less time with their mothers but walks, rides, expeditions with parents were certainly encouraged so long as they did not interfere with the co-operative work of the community. The importance of play was evidently recognized since $1000 was spent upon a play house for the children.

Across the road from the main dwelling house, an extensive brick mansion, was a school building, a lecture room and a chemistry laboratory which indicates the more sophisticated kind of educational program which characterized the Oneida Community. In the school an elementary education was provided for all the children, with the Bible playing the usual leading role as a source of reading matter. However the students were encouraged to carry their studies beyong the usual three R's if they were at all inclined or able. Instruction was provided in history, French, Latin and science though over-immersion in study was no more encouraged than over-work in the community at large. Evidently at the secondary level there were some deficiencies, at least as measured by "outside" standards. Pierrepont Noyes found that he needed an extra year's study to prepare himself at Colgate Academy for entry to Colgate University. However, this was shortly after the break-up of the original Oneida Community and undoubtedly the quality

of education suffered with the dissension that accompanied the retreat from communism. Since enjoyment and entertainment were important characteristics of life at Oneida, both vocal and instrumental music were taught.

There was little fear of defection at Oneida, so complete was their confidence in the superiority of their own life-style, and it was customary to send young people away to outside institutions of higher education in pursuit of specialized knowledge that would enrich the community either culturally or practically. Talented young women were sent to New York to receive special education in music and a number of young men went to Yale to graduate in engineering, architecture, medicine and law.

It is important to emphasize that in spite of some specialization of function on the part of those with professional training as well as those with advanced technical skills related to manufacturing and agriculture one of the most emphasized labor policies of the community was the rotation of tasks. Consequently, in the course of their education young people were exposed to and taught as many of the trades practiced at Oneida as possible in order to increase the individual's usefulness to the community and to contribute to a well-rounded personal development. Another, and radical, aspect of Oneida educational philosophy was that the girls as well as the boys were taught trades. They worked at lathes and as machinists for example, in fact in all the occupations which they could handle without physical detriment. Manual labor was not despised, though onerous and boring jobs were rotated more rapidly than pleasant or absorbing work. Children were involved not only in the customary helping with chores but when they

were old enough were actually engaged in the productive economy of the community. They regularly made the boxes for the spool silk which was manufactured at Oneida, thus contributing materially to the economy of the group.

In charge of educational programs was one of the twenty-one standing committees of the community, and the administration of the school was carried on by one of the forty-eight departments. Thus the members of the community participated fully in the organization, management and financing of educational activities.

A well-stocked library, a printing press, a daguerrotype shop, the regular publication of tracts marked by humor as well as zeal, theatrical entertainments, picnics and a host of other recreational activities complete this picture of a group of people whose educational enterprises and innovations were not the least remarkable of their activities.

THE SECULAR COMMUNITARIANS

Although the secular communities were less successful than the religious, the educational ideas incorporated in them had a wider appeal because they were not tainted by religious beliefs that were regarded with some misgivings or hostility by those outside. In fact, with the founders of the secular communities zeal for educational innovation played almost as important a role as religious faith in the sectarian communities. Experimentation with new theories and practices in teaching children and adults was an integral part of the secular communitarian purpose.

In 1824 Robert Owen and William Maclure met for the first time in New Lanark, Scotland. Both had made fortunes in business and were able to spend considerable sums of money on experiments which enabled them to put into practice the reforms which they thought would ameliorate the dire conditions of the poor and thus prepare the way to a more humane society. Both men were convinced that education was the key to social improvement and yet to fashion a strong and well-cut key that would unlock the rusty bolts of a corrupted political and economic order they realized, was a formidable problem.

Robert Owen, self-made industrialist of genius had played the competitive game to the hilt, won it and subdued it to his purpose. His factory at New Lanark was not only a model of industry but of educational pioneering. In his Institute for the Formation of Character he put into practice policies which were daring in their defiance of earlier educational traditions. But these programs he intended merely as an example of the way in which those three-fourths of the population of the British Isles who formed the poor and working class should be educated. In *A New View of Society* Owen in his "Essay First" summarizes the fundamental principles of his educational philosophy.

> These plans must be devised to train children from their earliest infancy in good habits of every description (which will of course prevent them from acquiring those of falsehood and deception). They must afterwards be rationally educated, and their labour be usefully directed. Such habits and education will impress them with an active and ardent desire to promote the happiness of every individual, and that without the shadow of exception for sect, or party, or country, or climate. They will also insure, with the fewest possible exceptions, health, strength and vigour of body; for the happiness of man can be erected only on the foundations of health of body and peace of mind. [11]

And Robert Owen could add:

> The beneficial effects of this practice have been experienced for many years among a population of between two and three thousand at New Lanark, Scotland.[12]

In the New Lanark Institute Owen had indeed emphasized the importance of the early years by providing infant classes, and his rejection of punishment as an effective deterrent to anti-social behavior was evident in the substitution of kindly treatment for harsh discipline. Open-air programs of observation, manual and physical activities, and discussion predominated over book learning in the curriculum at New Lanark, although the children apparently read well. The Duke of Kent's physician, Dr. Henry Gray Macnab wrote in his Report that "the children and youth of this delightful colony were superior in point of conduct and character to all the children and youth" he had ever seen. Indeed the fame of Owen's New Lanark project brought thousands of visitors every year not only from Britain but from every European country and from the United States.

This educational philosophy Owen had arrived at through his own reflections influenced by his practical experience in factory management and his own profoundly humane concern which compelled him to press for expansion of schemes to redeem the poor and oppressed. In Switzerland, a visit to Pestalozzi's school at Yverdon and to Fellenberg's institution at Hofwyl in 1818 confirmed for Owen the essential correctness of his educational ideas. His observations there also inspired him to further efforts on behalf of the education of the masses.

William Maclure, after making a substantial fortune in Scotland, settled in Philadelphia in 1796.[13] This city, owing to Franklin's endeavors, had become the center of scientific activity in the United States. Here Maclure devoted himself to his interests in science and education. In 1809 his publication of *Observations on the Geology of the United States, Explanatory of a Geological Map* established his reputation as a leading scientist. In 1805 Maclure too discovered Pestalozzi's school at Yverdon while on a geology expedition in Switzerland. During the next seven years Maclure spent some time each summer revisiting the school and absorbing Pestalozzi's ideas. Maclure was then instrumental in persuading a number of distinguished disciples of Pestalozzi to go to America and set up schools there. Joseph Neef, Madame Fretageot and Guillaune Phiquepal d'Ausnant all arrived in the United States within the next few years. With the establishment of a school in Philadelphia by Neef and his publication in 1808 of the *Sketch of a Plan and Method of Education* the Pestalozzian movement had made an effective start in America. Meanwhile the indefatigable Maclure, in between roaming for rocks, decided that a newly (and as it turned out very temporarily) liberalized Spain was a suitable site for an enlightened educational experiment. In 1819 at Alicante he set up an agricultural school on Pestalozzian principles, combining physical labor with moral and intellectual instruction. Unfortunately the experiment was short-lived. The hostility of the church and invasion by the French army in 1823 led to the confiscation of his land and necessitated his escape. It was from Spain that Maclure went to Britain and to his meeting with Robert Owen, an

important development in the history of American education since both men were ripe for suggestions and sites suitable to the more fruitful execution of their social and educational enterprises.

Robert Owen's decision to establish a community in America rather than in the British Isles was not determined by the usual visions of this country as the New Jerusalem but by the decision of the Rappites to sell their Indiana properties and move back to Pennsylvania. These lands and buildings already built for community living were available at a price which Owen could afford and roughly for one quarter the amount he had estimated as necessary for a similar site in Britain for his project. By early September of 1824 Owen had completed the preliminary arrangements according to William Maclure who was almost as anxious to test his educational theories on a suitable progeny as was Owen to test his social theories in a suitable environment.

The hopeful optimism which surrounded the founding of the New Harmony Society in 1825, the explainable and yet inexplicable inability of Owen to come to terms with the practical problems of organizing to meet the immediate problems of such an innovative undertaking are contradictions in the history of New Harmony that cannot be detailed here. The rapid demise of the New Harmony community however, in no sense invalidated the precise educational practices of either Owen or Maclure. It does, as will be seen below, throw light upon a difference of opinion between the two men as to the source from which change is initiated and carried through, a difference that is a crucial one in the history of socialist educational thought.

Meanwhile from 1825 to 1826 many of Owen's educational ideas were put into practice at New Harmony. First, the whole community accepted responsibility for the provision of life-long education to all. By December of 1825, even before Maclure's party arrived, 140 children were all boarded, clothed and educated at public expense.

A second principle that is important both in the history of American education and of socialist educational ideology is that no religious instruction was given in the schools at New Harmony. Neutrality in matters of religion was important as a basic principle as well as vital to the promotion of unity. In writing of the church and its doctrines in *A New View of Society*, "Essay Third" Owen said,

> The doctrines which have been and now are taught throughout the world must necessarily create and perpetuate, and they do create and perpetuate a total want of mental charity among men. They also generate superstition, bigotry, hypocrisy, hatred, revenge, wars and all their evil consequences. . . . Let this source of wretchedness, this most lamentable of all errors, this scourge of the human race be publicly exposed; and let those just principles be introduced, which prove themselves true by their uniform consistency and the evidence of our senses. . . .[14]

Realistically appreciating that religious indoctrination held sway over the minds of many of the adults who came to New Harmony (no conditions had been imposed to screen members) the church building was open to preaching by visiting clergymen although Sunday mornings were given over to a lecture on ethics. In spite of the warm welcome given to Owen in the United States by Presidents, elder statesmen, political, social, and educational leaders, this did not prevent some

extremely vitriolic attacks upon Owen's religious apostasy by outraged defenders of the doctrine of original sin and human depravity. They asserted that his belief that man's character was fashioned by environment and circumstances undermined the sense of personal moral responsibility, But Owen, an astute propagandist, seized these occasions for debate as an excellent opportunity for the dissemination of his own ideas. His marathon eight-day debate in Cincinnati in 1829 with the Reverend Alexander Campbell who defended orthodox Christianity is an example of this.

The foundation of the children's program at New Harmony was the Socialist principle that the individual realizes himself in the welfare of the community.

> The time the children will remain under the discipline of the play-ground and school will afford all the opportunity that can be desired, to create, cultivate and establish those habits and sentiments which tend to the welfare of the individual and the community. . . the precept which was given to the child of 2 years old, on coming into the playground, "that he must endeavor to make his companions happy", is to be reviewed and enforced on his entrance into the school; and the first duty of the schoolmaster will be to train his pupils to acquire the practice of always acting on this principle.[15]

To reinforce this principle, to use labor power efficiently and perhaps to mitigate the possibly baneful influence of unenlightened parents, plans were made for children to board at school after the age of three.

The curriculum itself was notable for its insistence upon providing materials of instruction suitable to the child's level of development. The objectives were understanding and reasoning for,

said Owen,

> "Has not this ever been and will not this ever remain, the only path by which human knowledge can be obtained?"[16]

Reading and writing Owen believed were instruments by which knowledge might be acquired but as means were in no way to be confused with the end. This was to make meaning out of an assembly of facts.

Unfortunately the problems and mounting failures at New Harmony in the matter of organizing economic affairs prevented the interlocking of the industrial and vocational program of the school with the work of the village. Learning to produce and the acquisition of all useful and serviceable skills were certainly a part of the intentions of the school system. In spite of the problems that were to prove disastrous to the larger community the school children were engaged in practical work as part of the curriculum, that helped to finance the cost of the educational program.

That the pioneering at New Harmony was to prove so invaluable a contribution to educational progress in America however must be attributed as much to the work of William Maclure as to Robert Owen. For one thing, the "School of Education Society" which Maclure took firmly under his control as the larger New Harmony experiment disintegrated was to continue its activities for another thirteen years.

Maclure's educational work at New Harmony had begun in January 1826 when he arrived at the community with a distinguished group of scientists and teachers, the famous "boatload of knowledge". Although Maclure had had some misgivings about the New Harmony arrangements he had been deeply impressed by Owen's New Lanark educational institute.

Moreover he believed that a school directly and completely controlled by the community as the New Harmony project intended, afforded the opportunity for him to test his theory that "knowledge is power" if the knowledge is not distorted to a particular class interest. Maclure hoped that New Harmony would become a democratic, equalitarian community in property and rights, for he believed education is an instrument of power and can be used for good or bad ends depending on who controls it. America, he believed was not fulfilling its revolutionary promise, because it had retained a large number of the laws and customs of the colonial system and the elective power had been manipulated by the non-productive classes to rule the productive classes as certainly here as they were ruled by hereditary power on the other side of the Atlantic. In America educational institutions had not escaped this captivation and distortion to their own use by the ruling class. Maclure wrote

> But in no slavish imitation of the follies of Europe have we been so essentially injured in our vital principles, as in the copy we have taken and still continue to take, of their absurd monkish system of education. The charters of most of our colleges and universities are copies of Oxford and Cambridge in Britain; all occupied with creations of the imagination, nourished by the priest, to the total neglect of nature and her works![17]

and he felt that in educational matters the rich had provided for the consolidation of their own interests and for the advancement of their own offspring

> by granting exclusive charters, corporations, and monopolies. . . endowing universities, colleges and seminaries, for the education of the children of the rich with the people's money and neglecting to establish free schools for the instruction of the millions.[18]

The persons who were associated with Maclure in the School Society included not only the teachers Madame Fretageot, Phiquepal d'Ausnant and Joseph Neef but also a group of distinguished scientists, Thomas Say, the entomologist, Charles Lesueur, the geologist, and Gerard Troost, also a geologist.

In Maclure's School as well as the implementation of the Pestalozzian principles of combining mental and physical labor, and directing effort towards knowledge that would contribute to human happiness there was a notable advancement in the adoption of a scientific curriculum. A close connection was encouraged between teaching, research and the publication of newly gained scientific and useful knowledge. Chemistry, minerology, zoology, geology, arithmetic, mathematics, architecture were all systematically studied under the guidance of men of reputation already well practiced in methods of research.

Learning from the failures that resulted from the attempt to incorporate all kinds of trades into the New Harmony economy (for instance young William Owen had been baffled by the problem of putting three tobacconists to work) Maclure concentrated industrial training upon one area, trades connected with publishing, that is printing, engraving and coloring. He had long regarded the control of the press by the propertied and powerful in America as another important factor in the purposeful misinterpretation of the world to the working people and therefore a part of their miseducation. Therefore he believed that for the people to manage their own information services through the creation of their own printing press would be a significant step forward in the acquisition and management of knowledge and power. The fruits of this enterprise were realized in the publications of the school press, including

Opinions on Various Subjects, the radical educational philosophies of Maclure himself.

Significantly, although both Owen and Maclure were in agreement on the importance of education in redeeming society, and on the general principles of a system of education, they differed over the means of achieving the new society. In explicating the failure of New Harmony, Maclure concluded that Owen's generous input of his own fortune had been one of the major reasons for failure. The benevolence of Owen had corrupted the community, allowing the inhabitants to consume and not produce, to rely on Owen instead of directing things themselves. In this explanation of the reasons for New Harmony's failure, Maclure had arrived in 1828 at an analysis of change which contained the germ of two later revolutionary socialist theories--the idea of the class struggle and the necessity for the working or producing people to control their own economic, political, and educational institutions. He had been dubious about Owen's faith in the goodwill of upper- and middle-class liberal reformers in England towards the education and welfare of the working people, but in 1828 Maclure doubted the efficacy even of the goodwill itself. He became convinced that the benevolence of the well-to-do was no substitute for the will and activity of the people themselves to remedy their condition in society.

> Whence are the millions to expect aid or assistance? From themselves--from the only class that is interested in their welfare. To look for help from any others, would be to expect an effect without a cause.[19]

As a final contribution to the emancipation of the working classes, and as part of his educational work there, Maclure financed in New Harmony a scheme of Working Men's Libraries.

Before leaving the Owenite community two other important aspects of educational practice that were to form an important link with twentieth-century socialist thought should be mentioned. One was the equality of opportunity in every branch of education that was accorded to women in the thought and practice of both Owen and Maclure. It should be noted too that women were also active agents in the school programs at New Harmony particularly in the persons of the indomitable Madame Fretageot and Jane Owen, Robert's daughter. The other innovation was the work of Robert Owen's disciple Frances Wright carried out in the Nashoba Community she founded in Shelby County, Tennessee. The particular objective of this community was to provide a method for peacefully liberating black slaves, but it was also an early experiment in racial integration. Wright was convinced in the best Owenite tradition that "children collectively may be taught any sentiments and habits" and sought to eliminate racial prejudice by having young black and white children of the community live, study, and work together at the earliest age possible.

Certainly New Harmony and the smaller Owenite societies associated with it failed to convert America to the communitarian principle, but a number of dynamic educational principles had been brought to public attention. Through the working men's libraries and through newspapers like *The Free Enquirer* (formerly *The New Harmony Gazette*) the educational philosophies of these early socialists continued to be widely disseminated.

Although the projects of Owen, Maclure and their associates might be described as the climactic high point in the introduction of

a revolutionary educational ideology to the United States, the Associationist movement in the 1840's revived public interest in socialist principles of education and added one or two new ingredients. Albert Brisbane's book *The Social Destiny of Man* published in 1840 introduced to Americans the core of Charles Fourier's elaborate plans for the reconstruction of society.[20] The time was propitious. The depression beginning in 1837 had caused much social distress so that working people as well as the conscientious among the relatively prosperous were looking for solutions to the depressions and consequent miseries of the present ecomomic system. With little systematic planning, with insufficient capital but with great enthusiasm dozens of ill-planned experiments in establishing Fourierist communities were started. Only three survived long enough to make any meaningful observations of their way of life possible and apart from the Brook Farm phalanx, none were remarkable for their educational institutions. In fact, the North American Phalanx in Red Bank County, New Jersey and the Wisconsin Phalanx in Fond du Lac County owed their success apparently to their waiving of intellectual enrichment in favor of economic viability, both eventually disbanding with some profit to their participants. The case at Brook Farm was different. Here, as at New Harmony, the educational venture prospered and made its own separate impact upon the larger world although its quality derived from its communitarian base. It is important to note however that the Brook Farm Community owed as much to Transcendentalist as to Associationist or Fourierist principles but in respect to the educational philosophy some of Fourier's ideas merely reinforced, and did not distort those already in practice at the school.

The members of the Brook Farm community counted themselves richest in intellectual power, and because they believed the "natural business of a true society to be doing the work of education", They decided early that they would accept children for fees to be educated alongside their own children. This educational service would be a way of assisting in the economic development of their society.[21] The intellectual distinction of the members of the Brook Farm Community and consequently the rich offerings of the school soon led to many more applications than the community could accept.

Education at Brook Farm was an intrinsic part of the life of the community. Learning was matched with productivity. John Van Der Zee Sears, recording his school days at Brook Farm, describes how he fed the rabbits and tended the garden in which herbs were cultivated for the Boston market.[22] George Ripley, the founder of Brook Farm wrote

> Our objects are to insure a more natural union between intellectual and manual labor than now exists. To combine the thinker and the worker, as far as possible in the same individual, to guarantee the highest mental freedom, by providing all with labor, adapted to their tastes and talents, and securing to them the fruits of their industry; to do away with the necessity of menial services by opening the benefits of education and the profits of labor to all; and thus to prepare a society of liberal, intelligent and cultivated persons, whose relations with each other would permit a more simple and wholesome life than can be led amidst the pressure of our competitive institutions.[23]

Thus at Brook Farm one sees again the principle of children learning to participate actively in the economic life of the community as an essential part of their education. This however was well mixed with the aim of securing as many hours as possible from necessary

toil "for the production of intellectual goods".[24] The Brook Farm community hoped to gather books, apparatus, and collections for science, paintings, sculpture, and as many means of beautiful amusement as possible which would be held in common. The honest toil of agriculture and industry which they would share together would be accompanied by a rich,creative,intellectual life. In the school at Brook Farm this purpose explains the emphasis upon the development of creative ability, for as an observer explained they said to one another,

> Let us go together and teach one another our various knowledges and skills; and above all let us teach our children according to their genius, and according to the genius of humanity, neglecting all those customs and prejudices which have no life in them. [25]

In pursuit of this the children who attended the Brook Farm School could select the subjects which they wished to study, though having chosen they were bound to follow the rules and programs of the teacher. Although it is likely that some of the more radical members of the community shared Henry David Thoreau's conviction that at Harvard he had studied all the branches of knowledge but none of the roots, the subjects that were available at Brook Farm included courses that would prepare the boys for college, and even carry them through their college courses. But this pragmatism involved no loss of liberal principle for Elizabeth Peabody writing on the *Plan of West Roxbury Community* explains the curriculum and the priorities within it.

> As agriculture is the basis of their external life, scientific agriculture connected with practice, will be a prominent part of the instruction from the first. This obviously involves the natural sciences, mathematics, and

> accounts. But to classical learning justice is to be done. . . The particular studies of the individual pupils, whether old or young, male or female are to be strictly regulated according to their inner needs.[26]

No attempt was made to retain unwilling, unco-operative or even unsuitable pupils at the school since voluntarism was a principle to which all were deeply committed. Therefore, those who attended the school as fee payers boarded at Brook Farm and were to work and enter fully into the community life. The community believed that the freedom of students to choose subjects, of instructors to find their methods "in the nature of the thing taught and the condition of the pupil to be instructed" would mean that "instruction would cease to be a drudgery, and. . . learning no longer a task".

Two other radical principles that the Brook Farm community intended to practice in their educational system need emphasis as we shall see their re-appearance in twentieth-century socialist thought. The first was the idea that equality of educational opportunity should be provided for all children regardless of the financial status of their parents. The opportunity would be limited only by the inward gifts, heredity, but all would inherit a good education from society and an independent place in it. Secondly it was hoped that the necessity of subserving education to the provision of the means of earning a living might be eliminated so that the true education of "individually self-unfolding" could begin in an atmosphere of complete social security.

Educationally, the importance of the nineteenth-century socialist experiments lies in their successful practice of the enlightened theories they sponsored. Particularly in the case of New Harmony and Brook Farm the educational arrangements were widely acclaimed

accomplishments that were only slightly tarnished by the failure of the communities in which they took place. In all the communities, the benefits of education were freely available to all members of the community. Any distinctions in the kind of education obtained depended upon variations in the ability or interest of the students. No class, and only minor sexual,distinctions were made. The Nashoba Community even offers an extremely early example of the principle of racially integrated education in operation. While all the communities faced problems of survival, all attempted to avoid over-specialization of the individual, encouraging instead participation in, and enjoyment of, a wide variety of physical, intellectual and manual skills. Although hard work was necessary and was often followed by some degree of material prosperity neither work nor wealth were seen as virtues in themselves. Joy and happiness, either in communion with God or one's fellows were more conspicuous as goals than individual accomplishment or riches. Both technical and scientific experimentation were encouraged in the Socialist communities. For example, the Shakers experimented with seeds and invented a washing machine, while at New Harmony, Maclure and his students conducted basic research in geology and natural history. Except where doctrinal prohibitions hindered their development in some of the religious communities, artistic expression in music, dance, poetry and drama were a part of the educational program, as well as the study and discussion of history and politics. Underlying all educational activities, however, was the unifying indoctrination in, and commitment to, the philosophy that individual fulfillment proceeded from harmonious and close relationships with the other members of the community and the pursuit of the common good.

NOTES

Chapter II

1. John Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity", *Life and Letters of John Winthrop*, Vol. 2 (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1869), p. 19.

2. Jonathan Edwards, "Some Thoughts concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New England", *Works of President Edwards*, Vol. 3 (New York: Leavitt, Trow and Co., 1844), p. 315.

3. Factual information on the religious communities is derived mainly from the contemporary descriptions given by William Hinds in *American Communities* (New York: Corinth Books, 1961); by Charles Nordhoff in *The Communistic Societies of the United States* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965); and by John Humphrey Noyes in *History of American Socialisms* (New York: Dover Publications, 1966). Other more recent works on the communitarians which include material on the Shakers, Inspirationists, Rappites and Perfectionists are included in the General Bibliography.

4. Charles Dickens, *American Notes for General Circulation* (London: Everyman's, 1907), pp. 211-15.

5. Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, Vol. 2 (New York: Saunders and Otley, 1837), pp. 310-14.

6. R.W. Emerson, *Complete Works*, ed. E.E. Emerson, Vol. 1 (Boston: Centenary Edition, 1903), p. 115.

7. Nathaniel Hawthorne, "The Shaker Bridal", Vol. 1 of *Complete Works*, pp. 469-76: and "The Canterbury Pilgrims", Vol. 3 of *Complete Works*, pp. 518-30, (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1882).

8. As quoted in Charles Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the United States*, first published 1875 (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), p. 59.

9. John Humphrey Noyes, *The Berean* (New York: Arno Press, 1969) passim.

10. Pierrepont Noyes, *My Father's House* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1937), p. 10.

11. Robert Owen, *A New View of Society*, a Facsimile Reproduction of the third edition printed in London in 1817 (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press), p. 27.

12. Ibid., p. 29.

13. William Maclure's life is the subject of a chapter in David Harris' *Socialist Origins in the United States* (The Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Co., 1966). There are also many references to the work in the United States, at New Harmony of both Maclure and Robert Owen in Arthur Eugene Bestor, Jr.'s *Backwoods Utopias*.

14. Owen, op.cit., p. 107.

15. Obid., p. 96-97.

16. Ibid., p. 99.

17. William Maclure, *Opinions on Various Subjects, dedicated to the Industrious Producers* (3 vols., New Harmony, Indiant, 1831-1838), Vol. I, pp. 105-106 as quoted in David Harris, *Socialist Origins in the United States* (The Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Co., 1966) p. 60.

18. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 3 as quoted in Harris, op.cit., p. 61.

19. Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 72, as quoted in Harris, op.cit., p. 65.

20. Albert Brisbane, *The Social Destiny of Man* (Philadelphia: C.F. Stollmeyer, 1840) passim.

21. Henry W. Sams, ed. *An Autobiography of Brook Farm* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 24.

22. John Van Der Zee Sears, *My Friends at Brook Farm* (New York: Desmond Fitzgerald, 1912), p. 68.

23. Sams, op. cit., p. 6.

24. Ibid., p. 25.

25. Ibid., p. 66.

26. Ibid., p. 28.

CHAPTER III

THE EDUCATIONAL VISIONS OF THE UTOPIAN SOCIALISTS: LAURENCE GRONLUND AND EDWARD BELLAMY

The conditions of extreme poverty and wealth, deprivation and excess, ignorance and privilege to which the communities offered so sharp a contrast, became more exacerbated with the progression of the Industrial Revolution in America. Between the peak period of experimentation in community living and the twentieth century came the blueprints for an improved society drawn by Laurence Gronlund and Edward Bellamy. This chapter will attempt to show how the ideas of Gronlund and their expansion and popularization by Bellamy added a new dimension of universality to the development of a Socialist educational ideology in the United States.

Charles Beard and John Dewey independently compiling a list of the most influential books published since 1885 in America, each placed Karl Marx's *Capital* in first place and Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* in second. The profound influence of Marx upon Socialist educational thought in America will be discussed in the next chapter. The advance of Socialist thought in America, however, owes much also to Gronlund's theory and to Bellamy's popular novel. Among those who read and commented enthusiastically upon Bellamy's work was John Dewey. He thought that *Looking Backward* might provide the same inspiration to social engineering that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* had provided for the abolitionist movement.

Edward Bellamy of Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts was the descendant of a long line of New England preachers, and the son of a Baptist minister. He possessed an active conscience which turned

towards the alleviation of social injustice. This had grown more acute even in his own environment as Chicopee Falls developed from a small rural town into an industrial community, with the familiar influx of immigrant workers, the appearance of slums and the polarization of the community into rich and poor. After a couple of years at Union College and a year in Europe Bellamy became a journalist and then, because of uncertain health, he took up literary writing. His most famous work *Looking Backward*, a science fiction novel, was published in 1887. Through the central character, Julian West, a young Bostonian who wakes in the year 2000 A.D. after having fallen into a mesmerized sleep in 1887, Bellamy contrasted the strife-ridden decaying capitalist order with a harmonious cooperative commonwealth which had evolved peacefully during West's extensive nap. The novel delivers a carefully reasoned but deliberate and scathing indictment of the state of affairs in the late nineteenth century and simultaneously describes the outlines of the new society which has taken its place. Since Bellamy believed that this new society would emerge peacefully as all classes realized the irrationality and immorality of the old he, in effect, mapped out the guidelines of a social reform policy.

What were the origins of Bellamy's social thought? It proceeded in the first place out of his humanitarian conviction and his sensitive reactions to the discrepancies that he witnessed between the lives of the rich and the poor. However there is little doubt that he arrived at a solution based on socialist principles after his reading of Gronlund's *The Cooperative Commonwealth* which had been published in 1884. Gronlund's discussion of the cooperative commonwealth incor-

porated much of the revolutionary social ideology of Marxism but with some important modifications that appealed to Gronlund and Bellamy, and which both thought would make Socialism more palatable to the American public. Gronlund emphasizes in his introduction to the reader

> Socialism is no importation but a home-growth wherever found. . . the social and political phenomena in all progressive countries and particularly in our own country and Great Britain are, in a perfectly natural manner, evolving a New Social Order, a Social Democratic Order which we have called the Cooperative Commonwealth.[2]

And Bellamy, in an introduction to the American edition of the *Fabian Essays* stated that "nationalism was a form under which socialism was brought to the notice of the American public."[3] He believed that the avoidance of the term Socialism would prevent the conjuring up, however falsely, of the demons of atheism, free love and violent revolution.

Although both Gronlund and Bellamy rejected the thesis of the class struggle, unlike Robert Owen and Maclure they did not think that a satisfactory educational system could be put into effect until an economic democracy had been achieved, that is until the means of production were publicly owned and operated for the general welfare instead of for profit.

> The bread and butter question is therefore the fundamental question. We see here again how socialism, by revolutionizing the economic relation of society will revolutionize all other relations. Education then will be the second important branch of the activity of the new commonwealth.[4]

Bellamy's position, as a prophet of a new society as well as a practical politician through his involvement with the Nationalist Clubs to which

Looking Backward had given birth, was a little more complex. In the latter role as an advocate of immediate educational improvement Bellamy believed that the primary tactic should be the winning of public ownership of the municipalities. Following or accompanying this, changes in the school laws should be made to accomplish three major goals. These were the raising of the age limit for compulsory education, the prohibition of the employment of children during school hours, and the payment of compensation to impoverished parents so that they could afford to allow their children to attend school.[5] This brief response by Bellamy to the demands for some concrete objectives to work towards in the present political system indicates however only a small part of his educational philosophy. This is described in more detail in *Looking Backward* by Dr. Leete, Julian West's guide to the new society. It parallels very closely Gronlund's reflections upon education in *The Cooperative Commonwealth.*

The very fact that all progressive countries are committed to the development of a common school system and concerned with the problems of an educational program for the masses is seen by Gronlund as one of the signs that the birth of a new commonwealth is imminent. It is, so to speak, the three R's on the wall. Significantly, for the Socialist educational theories of the early twentieth century he accepts as valid all the conservative arguments against any education for the masses that goes beyond the most rudimentary. He agrees that in the present system the capitalist quite correctly views with alarm the prospect of a discontented over-educated work force, and finds the refusal of the rich to subsidize the education of the poor entirely appropriate to their interest in the present social system.

These are the mores of the old order and, like Saturn who consumed his own children as they were born, the old would resist displacement by the young and vigorous. However like Jupiter, who evaded his father's jealous eye and gained his throne, the succession of the cooperative order is inevitable too. All other observations and arguments about the utility of educating the masses were irrelevant compared with this one overwhelming inevitability, Gronlund believed. The economic democracy, the interdependent commonwealth Bellamy and Gronlund agreed would have to assimilate the industrial masses into the culture and for the first time in history the poor would enter the mainstream of society and partake of its benefits. The barriers which at the moment separate the rich from the poor frustrate the development of each individual as a complete personality. Only the well-to-do at present have access to institutions of secondary and higher learning because the system demands the payment of tuition fees. Profit is at the base of higher education as it is the motivating force in industry and this leads to the graduation of many unfit students while the latent talents of those who have no leisure and cannot afford the fees which the system demands go undeveloped.

The first principle to be established then in the cooperative commonwealth is that of equal access to education, at all levels. The need is for the provision of every possible opportunity that will enable individuals to discover their true merits and abilities. Gronlund feels that the kindergarten, which had just begun to appear in the United States had great potential value in this respect.

> The institutions that have already shown themselves specially adapted to the discovery and unfolding of these latent talents in children are the kindergartens.[6]

Bellamy writes that for the general welfare of the community and for the satisfaction of the individual, the discovery of aptitude is an essential part of the educational process.

> The principle on which our industrial army is organized is that a man's natural endowments mental and physical, determine what he can work at most profitably to the nation and most satisfactorily to himself.[7]

Specialization however, should not be the primary end of education. Gronlund thinks that a man trained for one area only was never able to exercise the best judgment even in regard to that area compared with the man of broad education and sympathy. Schooling should certainly include manual training, according to Bellamy and Gronlund. In *Looking Backward* youth is not only acquainted with a thorough theoretical knowledge of the nation's industries and agriculture but has to be familiar with tools and methods of operating them. Everyone is to serve in an industrial army for three years, doing work of a manual kind. Kindergartens, Gronlund thinks, will also be important in encouraging in all an early ability in, and taste for, manual activity. Regular visits to, and long inspections of workshops and industrial enterprises are a regular feature of Bellamy's school curriculum. While every attempt is made to fit the necessary work of the nation to the preference of the individuals, students are expected to prepare themselves for alternative occupations so that the system of training and employment has a flexibility which enables it to adapt to changing techniques, inventions and demands. Admission to professional higher education, to the schools of "technology, medicine, art, music and higher liberal learning" is open and free of course. However, the program of study for these brain workers is long and arduous. Those who wish to undertake such

work are given many opportunities for self-testing before they make a decision to enter these schools. No decision as to career however is irrevocable and changes of occupation can be made. The performance of tasks that are physically exhausting or disagreeable is made more bearable by shortening the hours of work, or calling for volunteers.

Physical health and strength, as well as happiness, being a matter of major concern to the nation, Bellamy's hero, Julian West observes with surprise how magnificent is the appearance of the young people compared with those whom he know in 1887. Dr. Leete explains that

> The faculty of education is held to the same responsibility for the bodies as for the minds of its charges. The highest possible physical, as well as mental development of everyone is the double object of a curriculum which lasts from the age of six to twenty-one.[8]

The true purpose of education for the individual is the harmonious and balanced cultivating of all the faculties. The real end of learning is not training, vocation, or profession but devotion to the cultivation of knowledge, enabling people to develop intellectual sympathies and refinements which have no reference at all to the sort of work they do. Bellamy notes the results of this philosophy upon the people of the new society.

> All have some inkling of the humanities, some appreciation of the things of the mind, and an admiration for the still higher culture they have fallen short of. They have become capable of receiving and imparting, in various degrees, but all in some measure the pleasures and inspirations of a refined social life.[9]

This fulfills the first requirement of the new educational system which Bellamy says is

> the right of every man to the completest education the nation can give him on his own account, is necessary for the enjoyment of himself.[10]

Public service not private good, however, is the ethic to which all in the cooperative commonwealth subscribe, and which is the dynamic of the educational system as indeed of the whole society. The primary social object of education then is to establish firmly in the minds of all students that there is an "indissoluble association between their individual happiness and the good of all."[11] Children, Gronlund asserts, belong more to society than to their parents, particularly in matters of education since the effects of this will be felt in society through the behavior of these children long after their parents are dead and gone. While he is not opposed to the family Gronlund feels that it can act as an anti-social force if family exclusiveness is emphasized over public spirit. As it develops, modern democracy casts off the old patriarchal authority and liberates the young for cooperative living and loyalty to everyone in the community. In his discussion of the relationship of education to society's needs Bellamy again and again uses the word serve. Like money making in the old capitalist system serving the community is the aspiration of all in the new commonwealth. At the completion of their formal education at the age of twenty-one all young people enter the industrial army for three years service as common laborers. Even after this service is completed there is never any difficulty in finding volunteers to undertake onerous but necessary tasks for the public good. Whenever any conflict arises between the need of the nation and the desire of the individual, the former takes precedence. For example, entry into the higher professional schools

is limited to those under thirty because too brief a period of service to the public would remain if those of riper years were admitted.

Bellamy also gives priority to goals of sociability and harmony over utilitarian considerations. If it were impossible to afford to educate all then he would educate those who were by nature "coarsest and dullest" since those well endowed are less in need of assistance in attaining culture and refinement of manners. Sociableness is impossible where differences of knowledge, taste and interest are too great. "A cultured man in your age was like one up to the neck in a nauseous bog solacing himself with a smelling bottle," Dr. Leete comments contrasting the confinement of education to the prosperous in 1887 with the general elevation of the whole population in 2000 A.D.[12] Gronlund also believes that there is a greater need to diffuse that knowledge which is already available than to collect more isolated information. The anarchy of opinion which characterizes the age preceding the transition to socialism will be replaced by assimilation and unification of ideas. "It is just as natural for healthy men to think and believe alike as it is for healthy men to see alike," he concludes.[13]

Gronlund and Bellamy were full supporters of an equal status for women and girls. Both men attribute equal intellectual powers to the female sex though both took a "*vive la difference*" approach to the goals of education for women, using such ambivalent terms as "appropriate functions" and "true companionship". Gronlund felt that females would be better educated in "institutions adapted for them" and rejoiced that they would no longer be "trained to please the man-fool."[14] In a lengthy chapter on the status of women in the cooperative commonwealth Bellamy

describes arrangements which might be characterized as separate but really equal since their separateness did not prevent women from serving in the highest branches of the executive and judiciary. Girls had the same educational and career opportunities as boys, save only that heavy labor was reserved for men, and that the girls worked in an auxiliary industrial army for their post-graduate term of public service. The abolition of distinctions of wealth and the realization of complete equality meant that females no longer prostituted themselves either in or out of marriage for material gain or advantage. In fact, women were completely independent economically, receiving the same subsistence and credit as every man in the nation. The result of these improved marital and romantic conditions was that the children of the new society were assured of a healthy physical inheritance through the process of natural physical attraction. They also of course benefited from having parents who were well educated and enlightened.

Finally one other important issue that is taken up by Gronlund and, interestingly, at the class room level, is the source of power and control. Bellamy, on the other hand, is cautious here. In *Looking Backward* those over forty-five have the right to vote and regulate the activities of the nation. Gronlund on the other hand suggests that full democracy be extended to the class room with a scholar-jury, scholar-suffrage in operation as proposed by Bentham. Thus, the students themselves would govern themselves under the principle of participatory democracy, determining relative achievement and the position of each other in the class room. This would not only be proper in itself to an interdependent socialist subcommunity but would teach

children that suffrage is a trust and that they should be in accord with their fellows, not in competition with them or against them.

Gronlund and Bellamy envisioned the application of the educational principles they described to the entire nation. This would be accomplished following the reasoned rejection of the capitalist system because of its mounting accumulation of inefficiency and violence that accompanied it. The adoption of a Socialist economy would lead immediately to the development of a Socialist educational system. None of the major educational ideas practiced in the communities were rejected, though in predicting a wholly secular state both Gronlund and Bellamy dismissed religion as an element in education. Unlike the communitarians Bellamy recognized the increasing complexity of advanced learning and suggested methods of self selection, and even some community imposed restrictions on absolute equality of access to the higher professional schools. Both Gronlund and Bellamy firmly supported the primacy of general as opposed to specialized education. Bellamy also believed in the principle of compensatory education. It was essential, if educational resources were limited, to redress the deficiencies of those who had been deprived by nature or circumstance of enlightened minds. The more privileged in heredity or environment could better take care of their own educational development without detriment to the public. Gronlund was more radical than Bellamy in encouraging the young to direct and manage their own educational activities. Both Bellamy and Gronlund believed that from an early age the concept of public service must be taught to prevail over notions of private good.

NOTES

Chapter III

1. Elizabeth Sadler, "One Book's Influence", *New England Quarterly* 17, December 1944, p. 533.
2. Laurence Gronlund, *The Co-operative Commonwealth* (Lee & Shepard, New York, 1884), p. 7.
3. Quoted in Sadler, *op. cit.* p. 539.
4. Gronlund, *op. cit.* p. 222.
5. Edward Bellamy, "Looking Backward Again", *North American Review*, 150, 1890, pp. 362-363.
6. Gronlund, *op. cit.* p. 231.
7. Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward, 2000-1887* (New American Library, New York, 1960), p. 59.
8. *Ibid.* p. 152.
9. *Ibid.* p. 151.
10. *Ibid.* p. 152.
11. Gronlund, *op. cit.* p. 224.
12. Bellamy, *op. cit.* p. 151.
13. Gronlund, *op. cit.* p. 233.
14. *Ibid.* p. 232.

Chapter IV

THE INFLUENCE OF MARXISM ON EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT IN AMERICA

Marx called the communitarian Socialists utopian not because he scorned their ideas but because he thought that their method of implementing Socialism could not transform the larger society. Nevertheless Marx believed, with these Socialists, that man fulfilled himself in association with others. He believed, in common even with the millennial Christian Socialists although in a more down to earth location, that the real awakening of the human spirit was to occur in the future. Like Bellamy and Gronlund, Marx's vision of Socialism involved the whole society in the inevitable creation of the cooperative commonwealth. Unlike Bellamy and Gronlund, Marx saw in history the conflict of social classes as the dynamic that moved society forward. In the age of capitalism it was the dispossessed class of working people who through their experience with, and education in, their deteriorating economic position would struggle with the small wealthy ruling class and eventually claim the ownership of the productive resources. This conflict between these two classes would be the result both of the concrete experiences of the working class with the effects of the monopolization of wealth, education and culture by the ruling class, and of the educational activities of Socialists. They would act as catalysts of working-class consciousness until conflict was resolved by their attainment of economic power. The terms of the struggle would depend upon its national location. Where political democracy was well established the transfer of the resources

and institutions to the control of the mass of the people might be accomplished without force. Elsewhere, violent revolution might be necessary for the seizure of economic and political power from the reluctant ruling class.

The greatest dissimilarity between the nineteenth-century communitarian and visionary Socialists and the Marxist Socialists is in the defining of the locus of revolution and regeneration, in the masses of the people themselves. Their assumption of ownership over the means of production would result in a new quality of life in which the conflicts of economic interest that have vitiated all previous human history would no longer exist.

In scientific or Marxist Socialism vision then is combined with activism in the creation of political parties and the aggressive dissemination of revolutionary ideas of all kinds relating to the achievement of a new society and a new man. It is with the attempt to organize an effective party to transmit the ideology that this next section is concerned.

As millions of Americans were reading *Looking Backward* attempts were being made in America to form political parties based upon the principles of scientific Marxist Socialism. Because Marxism was the most important single influence upon Socialist thought in America after 1890 this chapter will describe briefly its dissemination through the organization of Socialist political parties in this country. Also the subsequent impact of Marx's theories will be examined and the translation of these theories into the educational thought of American Socialists will be illustrated from their writings.

Even before the Civil War a convention of the General Working Men's Association had called for "Education and Instruction" for the workers through an extension of educational facilities. In every attempt to form, first a political party to represent the working man's interests and later, Socialist parties, a demand for the improvement or provision of educational facilities for working people was a part of the platform. William Maclure's belief that the ability to read, write and reason would have to precede the assumption of control over society by the producers for society seems to have been an assumption of all workers' organizations. The Southern slaveholders' obsessive fear of the literate slave involved a principle of control whose implications were not lost on the working-class leadership. Educational reform was therefore a central concern of the labor movement.

When in 1868 a conference of delegates from the early trade unions organized a National Reform Party, they received greetings from the International Working Men's Association in London whose leading light was Karl Marx. Although this small party had passed out of existence by 1874 it marks the beginning of the attempts in America to organize a political movement upon Socialist principles. In 1874 the Social Democratic Working Man's Party of North America was founded. Most of its members were German immigrants who had withdrawn from the International Workingmen's Association as it decayed in New York. In 1876 a national convention of working men was called by the Social Democratic Party to bring about a union of all the nascent Socialist organizations in the country. Members of the Labor Party of Illinois joined with representatives of the Social Democratic Party and the International Working Men's Association to bring about the birth of a new party in the United States dedicated to workers' interests. Its platform was an

exposition of Marxist policy. In 1877 the name was changed to the Socialist Labor Party of North America. However only about 10% of the members were native Americans and the party was faced with the problem of reaching out to win support from, and give education in Socialist principles to, the American masses. Two policies alternated in pursuit of these goals--the active promotion of and participation in trade union growth and the attempt to gain electoral victories at all levels of the political structure for Socialist candidates.

The party grew rapidly with the financial depression, starvation, misery and bloody clashes of the late 1870's to a membership of 10,000 spread over twenty-five states. With the temporary return of prosperity in the 1880's the active membership began to decline, and during this decade the Socialist Labor Party remained predominantly German in its composition. In 1889, the conversion of Daniel DeLeon, lecturer at Columbia Law School and until then ardent supporter of Bellamy's Nationalist Crusade, to Marxism and membership in the Socialist Labor Party was an important event in American Socialist development. DeLeon, linguist, historian, lawyer, was a skillful lecturer able to popularize Marxist theories on the platform with his use of humorous and appropriate metaphor. His promising academic career was abandoned for a comradely but squalid life in an East Side tenement as he devoted himself to the Socialist cause. He insisted upon the necessity for activity both in the political and economic sphere.

> If you have an economic organization alone you have a duck flying with one wing; you must have a political organization or you are nowhere. . . The capitalist is organized on both lines. You must attack him on both.[1]

This ability on the part of DeLeon to see the necessity for purposeful advancement of the Socialist message on all fronts, including the need to make use of and transform the educational system, was an important contribution to the clarification of tactics. However, his dogmatic devotion to the principle of forging the Socialist Labor Party into a proletarian revolutionary organization (based uncompromisingly upon the class struggle thesis) led to the expulsion of those who vacillated in matters of policy or who deviated from DeLeon's decisions. From 1893 to 1901 a number of Socialists who did not see eye to eye with DeLeon had been expelled from the Socialist Labor Party and others had resigned as they found their separate judgments on questions of policy and tactics opposed by the impervious will of their leader. These men included Socialists of some ability like Morris Hillquit, A.M. Simons, Victor Berger, who were later to play important roles in the American Socialist Party.

In 1898, under the leadership of Eugene Debs who had been converted to Socialism while in Woodstock Jail, the Social Democratic Party was founded emerging from the membership of the American Railway Union and the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth. The Social Democratic Party was a Socialist party though its *Declaration of Principles* shows its ideological links not only to Marxism but to the evolutionary ideas of the now almost defunct Nationalist Movement. It called upon

> all honest citizens to unite under the banner of the Social Democracy of America so that we

> may be ready to conquer capitalism by making use of our political liberty and by taking possession of the public power.[2]

An article in *The Social Democrat* however asserted that "The Social Democracy is a political organization which recognizes the class struggle and is based on the principles of International Socialism".[3] Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the Social Democracy was its colonization scheme which linked it with the earlier tradition of communitarian experiments and indicated a connection, at least in spirit, between them and the political Socialist movement. The *Declaration* said that one state of the Union would be selected for the concentration of the supporters of the Social Democracy and into this state cooperative industry would be introduced. From this nucleus of Socialism the National Cooperative Commonwealth would be brought into being by a gradual extension of the cooperative method from one state to another.

One other ideological movement that arose in response to the challenge of Marxist philosophy and which cannot be omitted from a discussion of the sources of Socialist ideas was the Christian Socialist Crusade. It never embraced more than a minority of American Protestant churchgoers but its message was convincingly preached by an articulate leadership. Vida Scudder, a professor at Wellesley College, W. D. P. Bliss, an Episcopalian minister and George Herron, a Congregationalist minister and professor at Grinnell College believed that the ethics taught by Jesus of Nazareth and the behavior practiced by him were Socialist. Christ, a carpenter had fed the hungry, praised the poor, chastised the rich and renouncing the making of profit had lived the life of perfect service to society. All the virtues which Christ had

exemplified in his own behavior and extolled in his preaching were incorporated in Socialist philosophy and were antithetical to the spirit of capitalism and rugged individualism. Bliss, who was the principal spokesman of the radical clergy and laymen until 1896 rejected the necessity of the class struggle as a means of achieving social justice, believing instead that American political democracy would permit the peaceful evolution of Socialism. *The Dawn: A Magazine of Christian Socialism and Record of Social Progress* was the vehicle of the Society of Christian Socialists which Bliss founded at Boston in 1889 with the motto, "He works for God who works for man". Municipal ownership of productive resources and of all utilities to provide for the welfare of all and to eliminate the division between the few who possess and the rest of the people, was advocated as the best way of realizing Socialism with a democratic control which would remain close to the people.

George Herron's dynamic and controversial preaching, speechmaking, and writing enabled him to reach and influence (as well as irritate) a much wider public than W.D.P. Bliss. Like Bliss and Scudder, Herron believed that Socialism was compatible with the best American traditions of extending the scope of freedom and could be evolved through the democratic political framework already in existence. Herron asserted that the goals of Socialism were <u>immediately moral</u> in eliminating the injustices visited upon the masses and <u>ultimately spiritual and idealistic</u> in making possible "a vast and collective fulfilling of the law of love" which is the Christian gospel. Unlike Bliss he agreed with the Marxists on the necessity of developing

a sense of class consciousness among the workers. This was not to be confused with class hatred but was to be used constructively to unite the masses for their task of creating a new society out of the decay of capitalism. Having quietly supported the Socialist Labor Party from 1893, Herron openly announced his allegiance to Socialism as a political movement in 1899 with the formation of the Social Democratic Party. In 1900 he opened, with Debs, the Socialist presidential campaign and played a vital role in the reconciliation of splinter members of the Socialist Labor Party with the Social Democratic Party. This led to the birth of the American Socialist Party in 1901. The literature of American Socialism in the twentieth century reveals the very considerable influence in its midst of those who were led to their political convictions by way of the Sermon on the Mount as well as those whose Socialism traces its origins to the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels.

The Socialist Party whose founding was celebrated by the singing of the Marsellaise in Indianapolis in 1901 arose then out of a confluence of radical philosophies and experiences. The great triumph at Indianapolis was the merging of every significant Socialist organization in the United States except the DeLeon faithfuls in the Socialist Labor Party. They continued their separate existence singlemindedly devoted to no compromise with what they considered to be reformist approaches to the achievement of Socialism.

The creation of a nationwide party with a predominantly American membership meant that a vehicle stood ready to carry Socialist programs and ideas for a new society into all sections of the country.

As the works of Marx were increasingly made available in America his theories became heated topics of debate among intellectuals. Onto the eclectic body of American Socialist thought that had grown up in the nineteenth century Marx's ideas were grafted with varying degrees of acceptance. It is essential to realize however that these theories came to the Socialists of the early twentieth-century purely as theories. Although they were revolutionary, controversial and repugnant to some, the ideas themselves had not been prejudiced by any large scale attempts at implementation, however far removed such endeavours might be from some of his principles. The Bolshevik Revolution was still in the future. Further, in attempting to indicate the impact of Marx's ideas upon educational thought a distinction has to be made between the pervasive, but probably rather incomplete influence of his philosophy upon thousands of American Socialists and the absolute commitment to certain of his premises which was confined to a relatively small number. Marxism had become the main current in the river of Socialism but in America old and vigorous streams continued to pour into it also. The wide appeal of the American Socialist Party from 1900 to 1915 and from 1917 to 1919 can be attributed to its fusing of radical viewpoints with versions of social reform that sought the immediate amelioration of the worst effects of capitalism upon the working people. The programs of the reform element were distinguishable from progressivism chiefly in their theoretical bases and in the

understanding of their authors that they were means to an end, not ends in themselves.

Marx's writings, though voluminous and comprehensive do not contain any one work devoted to the development of a theory of education, comparable for example, to Rousseau's *Emile*. While Marx is restrained in drawing up blue-prints for the classless society of the future, and the nature of educational processes in it, he does portray Socialist man as spontaneously creative, as he realizes his liberation from the fragmentation and alienation that had characterized his condition under capitalism. Marx's philosophy is thus as pregnant as Plato's with discussions of ends and means that are related to educational thought. There are specific references in a number of Marx's works to educational problems as well as a view of the direction which social development will take which has important implications for educational practice. Art, law, morals, education, literature, the whole range of mental life would be transformed by the Socialist spirit in action. The call to be aware of the evolution of history, to be allied with progressive social forces was the central dynamic of Marx's message. This challenged Socialists to involve themselves in all kinds of educational, social and cultural activities to move them in the direction of control by the people. The breadth of the struggle to reach the new society is always emphasized, as well as its roots in the conversion of the masses through education and enlightenment. Democracy as the mere possession of votes was only of partial significance, as William Maclure also had insisted, unless there was understanding of the realities of history, economics, politics and interest. The initial struggle was to enlighten the people and liberate

them from the control of those whose interests were opposed to the masses and who consciously or unconsciously misled them and their children. The moral core of Marx's thought regarding the education of the individual appears in his early work, *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*,

> A being only considers himself independent when he stands on his own feet; and he only stands on his own feet when he owes his existence to himself. A man who lives by the grace of another regards himself as a dependent being. But I live completely by the grace of another if I owe him not only the sustenance of my life, but if he has moreover created my life--if he is the source of my life; and if it is not of my own creation, my life has necessarily a source of this kind outside it.[4]

In the present condition where labor is compelled under the pressure of external necessities which preclude independence of choice and action, each man has a particular line of activity from which he cannot escape. Marx writes in *The German Ideology*

> He is a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd or a critical critic and must remain so if he does now want to lose his means of livelihood.[5]

This fragmented condition of man in which work is separated from self-fulfillment and becomes itself an objectified, marketable commodity is one of the developments of capitalism which will become so intolerable that it is one of the conditions directly leading to the revolution.

Two other developments however have to take place before the intolerable point is reached. First the mass of the people would have become completely dependent economically as opposed to the relatively small group owning all the resources and economic power of the nation. Secondly this situation would be accompanied by an enormous increase in productivity which, with rational distribution,would eliminate

the necessity of struggling for the necessities of life. To accomplish the emancipation of the masses from poverty (which may be interpreted from Marx's description as a relative rather than an absolute condition), to a state of independence and common ownership of the productive process, Marx believes that the overthrow of the economic-political power of the wealthy ruling class is necessary. Then will be the commencement of the socialized state of man in which production is regulated to satisfy the needs of people not the irrational demand for profit. Resources will be rationally controlled and under the collective ownership of the people. In such a state work will become meaningful because it will no longer be performed under the compulsion of external necessity.

> The freedom in this field cannot consist of anything else but of the fact that socialized man the associated producers, regulate their interchange with nature rationally, bring it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by some blind power; that they accomplish their task with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most adequate to their human nature and most worthy of it.[6]

In such a state work will not be artificially specialized but the all round development of the individual will be seen as a good for all as possible and desirable for a real existence.

> In communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, to fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd, or critic.[7]

Marx then is completely in agreement with the nineteenth-century American Socialists previously discussed in insisting upon the psychological satisfaction of an education which provides a well-balanced, multi-skilled individual. A person's education should encourage him to act (to be a hunter), to be patient in awaiting results (to fish), to develop and create (to breed cattle), to explore and imagine (to be a shepherd), and to philosophize, make meaningful and judge (to be a critic). Some combination of all these qualities of body and mind in the individual is to be the goal of Socialist education, not the development of one capacity to the exclusion of others as the demands of survival under capitalism now dictate. Participation in the production of the means of life is also part of the educational program, not for utilitarian reasons primarily but to ensure completeness of personality. Marx found this facet of Robert Owen's work particularly impressive and wrote of it in *Capital*

> From the factory system budded as Robert Owen has shown in detail, the germ of education of the future, an education that will in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labor with instruction and gymnastic, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings.[8]

The antithesis between mental and physical labor will vanish.

If this ideal of producing the well-rounded man is not unfamiliar in the history of education, particularly during and since the Renaissance, it must be emphasized that programs designed to achieve this end were intended for the sons, and occasionally the daughters,

of a social élite. Moreover consideration of any participation in productive labor was neither thought to be necessary nor desirable if any deliberate thought was in fact given to such an idea at all. These students after all were being prepared for positions of leadership in society, political, economic, or both combined in which the few had responsibility for the management of the many. The idea of extending such educational programs to the masses of the people, or even to many people was not considered beyond occasional references (as in John Locke's *Some Thoughts on Education*, for example) to increasing their diligence, efficiency and productivity as laborers. Marx and the Socialists on the other hand were primarily interested in the education and fulfillment of the humanity of the masses, anticipating that for the first time in history they might enjoy the benefits of civilization and not be separated from the fruits of their own labor.

E. F. Andrews, in a review article *The Monopoly of Intellect* thought that there was some similarity between the educational goals of the Socialists and those of the British gentry in this respect.

> The minor aristocracy, the gentlemen of England, living on the soil, in the open air, in a life of independence at once laborious and leisurely have been able to give their children good opportunities for development while at the same time they have not been able to dispense them from the necessity of work. Now, this is just the condition that socialism is seeking to make universal.[9]

None, Andrews continued, would be able to escape from the need for performing some kind of physical labor but all would be assured sufficient leisure for the full development of their intellectual and artistic faculties.

In a major article *Education and Socialism*, May Wood Simons discussed the goals of a socialist education system in much the same terms as Marx. Freedom for each one to develop his own methods of thought and initiative is to be the object of the new education. The system of today, she wrote in 1901, demands that children "toe the mark". The same work and the same way of doing that work is required of each one. Everything is dull and mechanical like the machines and routines that most of the students in the public schools are destined to man. "Skilled workmen in no way presuppose workmen with any individuality developed." Socialist education on the contrary would make possible physical development as well as mental. The importance of work with tools and materials is stressed so that the individual may express in material form his inner being. "For education to be of any value it must present a unity in the things taught", and thus secure "the highest possible harmonious development of human beings". Education under Socialist conditions, May Wood Simons continued, would produce men and women, "not machines".[10]

A Latter Day Brook Farm, an article by Leonard Abbott describes an interesting attempt to keep alive the Socialist ideals of the original Brook Farm in a Summer Brook Farm in the Adirondacks. Here Prestonia Mann, a kinswoman of Horace Mann and for some years the editor of *The American Fabian* built a house in which she aimed to establish a community which should express a "Socialist's ideal of fellowship and beauty". She did not believe that great social changes could be wrought through isolated experiments in social living, the author reports, emphasizing that she is a modern Socialist. Nevertheless, Prestonia Mann

did think that this summer community would keep burning the light of the original Brook Farm. Cooperation, fraternity and equality were the underlying principles of the house and a significant Socialist educational idea is seen in the participation of all in performing the chores of the community.

> The professor finds that his brain is sharpened, not dulled by a morning's work in the potato patch or the woodshed. The rendering of Chopin and Liszt is not found to suffer from the musician's useful labor in the kitchen or the hayfield.[11]

William English Walling in his book *The Larger Aspects of Socialism* correlates John Dewey's advocacy of "education through occupation not education for occupation" with the educational goals of Socialism. The criterion of value in acquiring skills is not measured by reference to any specialized technical accomplishment but by their contribution to the fullest possible development of the individual. This, Walling says, contrasts sharply with the present view in which the working class is considered in the whole social arrangement as so much machinery, having no share in the work that requires the application of either intelligence of imagination.[12]

The change from government by a plutocracy to truly democratic government would mean a complete and radical revolution in the fundamental goals of the educational system. This was the opinion of William Brown expressed in an article, *Plutocracy or Democracy*. While plutocracy reigns in America it has ordained that the purpose of the educational system is to fit the individual to gain a living and, if he is lucky, to manage private property. Thus the present curriculum is designed to pursue these ends. Brown elaborates sardonically. Reading enables

a man to read the stock market quotations. Writing prepares him to sign his name on checks and other commercial documents. Arithmetic prepares him to count his money and compute his profits and losses. While there are attempts to broaden the understanding of what constitutes an education success will be beyond grasp so long as the pursuit of private wealth is the over-riding drive in society. In a Socialist democracy, on the other hand, Brown continues,

> For the first time in human history education will be free to follow the natural lines which the real needs of men should dictate. The man will be the chief concern and therefore he will not be a money counter or a money getter. That will no longer be the aim of life. It will be possible then for men to live a true and ennobling life.[13]

The theme of man liberated from economic dependency in a community of free individuals was also discussed by George Herron, the Christian Socialist. In the capitalist state, Herron wrote, nearly all so-called truth is subsidized truth for

> Religion, political economy, literature, education, all have to pay their tribute of blood money and submit to the marks of ownership.[14]

Only in a society without economic debts can an honest account of what society is, and what it ought to be, find acceptance in the academy. Instead what is permitted as a science of society is a lot of academic jargon constructed upon foundations determined by capitalism. But socialism will replace competition, economic and social enmity, and the struggle of each man for himself, with cooperation and mutuality of interest in the social order. Then

> We can expect a free science and a free religion and a free art and free literature as well . . . For the noblest thinker is more or less directed by the economic sources from which he draws his sustenance.[15]

Finally in illustrating how Socialists described their educational goals the comments of A. M. Simons in an editorial in the *International Socialist Review* may be noted. Voices are everywhere being raised, he said, to demand that education be freed from the throttles of industrial slavery and the competitive system. In both England and America freedom is being sought so that

> the hired hand shall again become the creating artisan, and that the product shall be a thing of beauty and an expression of the creative instinct of the maker as well as a source of pleasure to the worker. . . which (demand) Morris and Ruskin sought to impress upon the world.[16]

That this re-integration of manual work, art and intellect would emerge from the emancipation of labor as a commodity to be bought and sold, was the exhilarating educational goal towards which American socialists aspired. It is with this conception of the "good" in mind that they appraised the existing educational system in the United States in the first decades of the twentieth century.

The view of history that Marx held is that "the mode of production of material life conditions the social, political, and intellectual life process in general". The educational system, like the state itself and the law are parts of the superstructure of society dependent upon the economic base. Moreover the ideas that support and justify this superstructure are those of the class which has control of material production.

> The individuals composing the ruling class possess among other things consciousness and therefore think. In so far therefore, as they rule as a class and determine the extent and compass of an epoch, it is self-evident that they do this in their whole range, hence among other things rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas and regulate the production of the ideas of their age; thus their ideas are the ruling ideas of the epoch.[17]

This monopolization of the means of generating ideas and setting the boundaries of morality was seen by the American Socialist, Louis Boudin as being the most difficult problem to overcome in teaching the masses. It was not only that the subject class was economically dependent upon the ruling class but that the latter used the power of moral suasion to sustain themselves in power. Religion had from time immemorial served as the bulwark of temporal power but in recent times its waning influence had been replaced by science and philosophy. Engels,too,had commented on the distortion of Darwin's scientific work by the spokesmen of the capitalist class to vindicate the social effects of laissez-faire theories.

> Darwin did not know what a bitter satire he wrote on mankind, and especially on his countrymen, when he showed that free competition, the struggle for existence which the economists celebrate as the highest historical achievement, is the normal state of the <u>animal kingdom</u>.[18]

Science, philosophy and religion, not invented by, but used by the ruling class all performed the same function of interpreting and justifying the pre-eminence of the wealthy in society. Boudin writes,

> The point is that usually the lower classes get their "ideas" - their religion, science, art, philosophy from the upper classes, and they are apt to be such as express and represent - in short "idealize" - the mode of life fo those classes and the principles underlying the same. . . the economic visibility of the ruling class expresses itself in a buoyant and aggressive ideology which seems to and often does, express the interests and aspirations of society as a whole.[19]

This indoctrination had been managed more effectively by the ruling class of capitalism than in any previous age, Boudin believed,

because the working class had been permitted to participate in the benefits of the spread of knowledge and yet was, in a particularly forcible way, absolutely dependent economically.

The German historian of Socialism, Professor Werner Sombart of Breslau University who contributed a series of articles to the *International Socialist Review* at the time of Simons' editorship, found this situation described by Boudin to be particularly striking in the case of the United States. In *A Study of the Historical Development and Evolution of the American Proletariat* he stated that in America, the "Promised Land" of capitalism society and character had attained traits of capitalism to a far higher degree than in any other industrial country. The lack of a feudal nobility and tradition gave absolute supremacy to the magnates of industry and commerce in the social realm. "Eminent spinners, influential shoe-black dealers, extensive sausage makers" together with the "railroad kings" have their feet upon the necks of the people. But Sombart found that it was the intellectual culture of the United States that revealed most infallibly the high development of the ideology of the dominant class. Sombart felt that every aspect of life was conceived in quantitative or monetary terms. Even those who were not engaged directly in trade were occupied with the question of how much they could make with their talents. The standard of success was doing more, gaining more, having more, than someone else. This quantification of life obstructed any attempt to create a harmonious and well-rounded life and resulted in a ubiquitous restlessness of spirit since any endeavour seeking only quantity was by its very nature, endless.

Discussing this penetration of capitalist morality and ideology to all levels in American society Sombart observed that the American laborer was not in any way antagonistic to these aspirations and values as such. Rather he would earn all that his strength would permit, almost without limit. As a result even the trade unions operated not to elevate the condition of the proletariat as a class or to overthrow capitalism but to advance the self-interest of particular working-class groups. Only in the United States, Sombart deduced from these observations, had capitalism developed as Marx had prophetically imagined. Nevertheless, Sombart noted, American history also offered in the birth of the Republican Party a precedent for the creation of a new party around a great issue, the abolition of slavery. Therefore, he suggested that what had been attained by the abolitionists in educating the country to the emancipation of black slavery might be achieved by the Socialists in enlightening and preparing the masses for the emancipation of white labor slaves from the fetters of capitalism.[20]

Joseph Cohen, a Socialist leader in Philadelphia thought that Marx's historical analysis showing that concrete facts precede ethical constructs had turned the "Hegelian system right side up." Observation of historical sequence demonstrates, he said, that "imagination cannot transcend experience. When philosophy tried to do so it floated in the air and fought the battle of the shades." Ideas were rooted in and responded to material historical fact. Nevertheless Cohen cautioned that this did not mean that the educator was therefore

an impassive bystander powerless to effect any changes in the minds of his students. This would ignore the fact that ideas were part of historical data. Different men were the products of other conditions and a changed education so that as society evolved it became divided into two parts, one of which was elevated above, more perceptive than, the rest of society. Marx had regarded Robert Owen as such a man, for his writings contained the "most valuable materials for the enlightenment of the working class".[21]

As the Socialists saw it, economic determinism, the view that ideas were formed by responses to material, objective conditions, no more absolved the Socialist educator from the responsibility to educate than the doctrines of predestination acquitted the Puritan of religious duties.

Johann Most, an immigrant Socialist, illustrated in his pamphlet *The Beast of Property* the way in which this dilemma of educating within a nonsocialist system was approached. Not until the "beast of property" was destroyed could the real education of the people begin. Such an education would secure them with the opportunity for equal development of mind and body, "merry recreation" and work, alternating with application of the mind. Most believed that this did not mean that nothing could or should be done in a capitalist society to forward the education of the masses. On the contrary, it was the obligation of all whose eyes had been opened to the villainy of the situation which capitalism had imposed upon the people, to bend every effort to explicate these conditions. Thus the people could become conscious of the realities of their plight and more rapidly promote the transition to Socialism.[22]

The scientific Socialist view of history in which ideas, laws, institutions were seen as deriving from economic realities was not of course new in America. James Madison's *Federalist Paper Number Ten* had considered the problem of adjusting the opposite interests of different economic classes. John Adams had deplored, in one of his most famous letters to Jefferson, the corrupting tendency in the state for the aristocracy of wealth and descent to monopolize position and power. A.M. Simons admired and made available to readers through the pages of the *International Socialist Review,* Frederick Turner's *The Significance of the Frontier in American History* as an excellent example of the application of the materialist interpretation of history to the American scene. However to economic determinism Socialists joined the more controversial theory of the class struggle.

It was Marx's contention that throughout history different classes had carried on a continuous struggle with each other, sometimes muted, sometimes open and violent, and that from the conflict came either the destruction of both groups or a revolutionary reconstruction of society. Whereas in previous eras there had usually been several classes existing simultaneously, the development of capitalism had narrowed the number of classes to two, the ruling class, or bourgeoisie, who owned the sources and means of production and the working class, or proletariat, who sold their labor for wages with which to subsist. Somewhat unclear was the situation of the intellectuals who, on the one hand sold their brain power for wages but, on the other hand in their life style and tastes more closely resembled the bourgeoisie. The difficulty in defining the position of this intellectual class in or out of the proletariat caused endless discussion among American

Socialists, a considerable proportion of whom were intellectuals. They could certainly at least identify themselves with the sections of the bourgeoisie who, as Marx said, join the revolutiontionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands, as the defects of the old society assume "violent, glaring" proportions.

Marx praised the bourgeoisie for its immense development of industry, commerce, navigation and all manner of enterprise, for its "accomplished wonders far surpassing the Egyptian pyramids, Roman aquaducts, Gothic cathedrals" and above all for its "constant revolutionizing of the instruments of production". This energy has given the world commodities which are like the "heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls". Not the least of the accomplishments of the bourgeoisie is its great intellectual production and its universalization of this knowledge.[23]

Marx observed that the bourgeoisie whose ascendancy began at about the same time as the discovery of America, building its own wealth in the form of private property and securing power in the control of the political institutions of the state, creates simultaneously an antagonistic class of proletarians. Their interests are diametrically opposed to those of the bourgeoisie and the opposition becomes more acute with the passage of time which exacerbates the differences between the two classes. The ruling class meanwhile, having been forced to extend some formal education to the laboring class nevertheless maintains a firm control over the system of education and as with everything else manipulates it for the perpetuation of its own interest. Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* commented on the interjection of ruling class values into the school and its response to the needs of that class rather

than the needs of the students. They were responding to a question concerning the takeover of the schools by the new Socialist state.

> But the education you provide, is it not socially determined? Is it not determined by the social conditions within whose framework you educate? Is it not determined directly or indirectly by society acting through the schools etc.? The influence of society upon education was not an original discovery of communists! They merely propose to alter the character of that intervention and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.[24]

The transformation of the educational process into one which would benefit the child and serve neither the interests of the bourgeoisie, nor the need of the proletarian parents to exploit the labor of their children was necessary, Marx thought. This outcome is dependent upon the achievement of control over the system of education by the working people themselves. Nevertheless, as Marx suggested, the bourgeoisie, having to rely upon the proletariat, even soliciting the aid of the proletariat in its struggle with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries is thereby forced to supply the working class with "its own elements of political and general education" thus providing the proletariat with the weapons that it will need to struggle against and take over the power of the bourgeoisie. The seeds of the Socialist future are generated in the capitalist present.

In the part real, part mythological belief that American society was open, mobile, and lacking in the rigid class structures of the old world,this class-struggle theory, of all Marx's ideas, found the least ready acceptance in American thought. Most Socialists accepted it however albeit with many disputes and discussions as to who constituted

the working class and much insistence by some that class struggle did not mean class hatred. Max Eastman expressed a rather typical view,

> The doctrine of the class struggle is flatly opposed to class hate. . . the true spirit for those on the underside of the class struggle is summed up forever in the words of Mother Jones to the warden of San Quentin--"Poor boy, God damn your soul, ye can't help it."[25]

The class struggle thesis was frequently reflected in Socialist writing about such matters as the control of the schools by boards that contained mainly businessmen, the nature of text books, and the motives behind specific programs in the schools,particularly the sponsorship of industrial education programs. There was also much critical commentary on the de facto exclusion of working-class children from secondary and higher education.

May Wood Simons diccussed the class nature of the educational system in an article *Education and Democracy*. There is, she wrote, one system of education for the rich and another for the poor. Unforunately the laborers think they are receiving an education because of the existence of a "nominal" system of common schools. The wider public congratulates itself that its common school system is equalled nowhere in the world. But the education supplied in all but a few of these common schools is a "quantity education" that prevents any free action of the mind.

> The workers are taught, not alone from the lecture platform and in the press, but in the public schools, those things that will best further and maintain the permanency of the present capitalist class.[26]

The problem for these who control the educational process is not whether to educate the children of the working class but how far it is safe to go

in making them intelligent while at the same time making sure that they do not learn to think for themselves.

The signs of the irresponsibility of the bourgeoisie and therefore the urgent need for their replacement as the controllers of education can be seen in their failure to distribute the benefits of industrial productivity to enrich and humanize the lives of the working class, which constitutes the mass of the people. There has been, Simons wrote, a tremendous increase in labor saving machinery and, rationally utilized, this machinery should have been the means of releasing a larger and larger portion of the population from manual labor so that these people could have some time for intellectual development. The menial labor that in former ages has been performed by slaves and which, it was reasoned by the non-slaves, was a necessary contribution to the creation of a civilized elite, could now be turned over to "bands of iron and steel". Philosophers would still be produced. The reason that this use of machinery has not occurred is that it is privately owned and managed for profit, not for the fulfillment of human needs. The use of the machines to free the laborer from constant toil and to afford him the leisure for the cultivation of his mind will require the ownership of the machinery by the people collectively, Simons concluded.

Walt Whitman was the favorite poet of the early twentieth-century Socialists and his lines were frequently quoted to support the Socialist belief that the realization of true democracy depended on the creation of new forms and institutions by the mass of the people themselves. Whitman's dream was used in behalf of the Socialists' educational ideals too as the following quotation shows.

> I say that democracy can never prove itself beyond cavil until it founds and luxuriantly grows its own forms of art, poems, schools, theology, displacing all that existed or that has been produced anywhere in the past, under opposite influences.[27]

In connection with the discussion of the need for the proletariat collectively to take control of education, Marx had some significant remarks to make about educational reform programs within a capitalist society. Marx's suspicion of the bourgeois controlled state as a sponsor of educutional reform can be seen in his *Criticism of the Program submitted to the Gotha Congress in 1875.*

The German Labor Party led by LaSalle had demanded "universal and equal education of the people by the state", and "general compulsory education with gratuitous instruction". Marx noted that free education meant very little in a capitalist state, pointing for example to Switzerland and the United States. In the United States, he said, there was even gratuitous learning in higher education in some of the states but this only meant in practice "that the upper class have their cost of education defrayed out of the general taxbag". Then Marx sarcastically denounced the idea that the state should be the educator of the people saying that "especially in the Prussian-German empire the state, on the other hand is in need of a very harsh education by the people".[28] Instead the state, as well as the church, should be excluded from any influence upon the school.

This suspicion of the Socialists concerning the role of the state and the government in education can be illustrated among Americans by a news article and commentary from the Socialist *New Review.*

In 1913, in the aftermath of the Pennsylvania Coal Strike and the Lawrence Textile Strike a proposal was under consideration in the United States Senate to impose a literacy test to restrict immigration. Senator Elihu Root, speaking in favor of the proposal called attention to the fact that 50% of the workers in basic industries were from southern and eastern Europe, according to the reports of the Immigration Commision. Unless a check were placed on this immigration, Root felt, the continuance of the basic industries which were necessary to all other industries would be threatened, and the rights of the "industrial oligarchs" would continue to be invaded by the "revolutionary aberrations of a collection of ignorant aliens!"

> It is of vital importance. . . that the men who are to consider the question of striking . . . shall be men instructed, men who are able to get in touch with the sentiments of American life, with the principles of American institutions.[29]

The author of this news commentary who was not identified compared the attitude of the slave holders and the capitalists to education. While the former were adamantly opposed to having their chattel slaves taught to read and write, the representative of the industrialists insists that their workers be taught to read in order that they can appreciate the "beauties of the wage-labor system" and so that they will rebel less vigorously against it.

Another example of this view of bourgeois controlled education as indoctrination-in-the-values-of-the-system is expressed by Arthur M. Lewis in a review article, *Benjamin Kidd's Religious Interpretation of History*. He asserted that the newspaper editor and the school master had usurped the "antiquated vaporings" of the preachers' as indoctrinators of the people.

> The schoolmaster is able to produce a slave psychology and at the same time develop this necessary intelligence. . . to comprehend the complex process of machine production.[30]

The ruling class with these superior weapons of mind control at their disposal has therefore, Lewis wrote, elevated the status and financial rewards of the schoolmaster, editor, and professor while the majority of preachers are nowadays almost starving.

In concluding this discussion of the application of Marx's philosophy to educational thought in America there is one other basic element that is significant--the evolutionary thesis. The *Communist Manifesto* was published in 1848, the *Origin of Species* in 1859. Within the same decade, Socialists observed, Darwin worked out in biological minuteness the same law that Marx had discovered in the complexities of social and economic relationships. "Darwin's book is very important and serves me as a basis in natural science for the class struggle in history," Marx wrote. Unlike the gloom which settled over the literature of naturalism in America in the wake of Darwin's discoveries, Marx's evidence interpreting evolutionary law in human history was suffused with confident optimist that evolution moved towards progressively higher forms of social organization. The belief that Socialism was, whatever immediate problems lay in its way, the inevitable outcome of capitalism, the certain next stage in the organic development of society inspired Socialists with an elevated sense of being agents on the side of history in the struggle forward. All things considered, and even looking as they did with horror on the ravages of an industrial revolution that had ridden rough shod over its human sacrifices, the Socialists felt that what was now, was superior to what had been.

It was also inferior in every aspect to what would be--in politics, in art, in literature, in education. The Socialist Joseph Cohen said that the ending of the career of the ruling class was the beginning of the career of the working class, and would clear the way for even greater intellectual achievement. He recalled the prediction of Emerson, "The reputations of the nineteenth century will one day be quoted to prove its barbarism."[32]

Conservatives have been defined as those who, looking back, justify existing conditions and ideals by the standards of the past. The Socialists, on the other hand judged the present in which they found themselves by its failures to approximate a more beneficent future. This is an important characteristic in their criticism of American educational arrangements, as the next chapter will attempt to demonstrate.

NOTES

Chapter IV

1. Daniel De Leon, *Revolution or Reform* (New York: pamphlet, 1943), pp. 31-2.

2. Quoted in Howard M. Quint, *The Forging of American Socialism* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1953), p. 292.

3. Ibid., p. 295.

4. Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1961), pp. 98-114.

5. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*, edited and with an introduction by R. Pascal (New York: International Publishers, 1939), p. 22.

6. Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 3 (Chicago: Charles Kerr and Co., 1906), pp. 954-55.

7. *The German Ideology*, op. cit., p. 22.

8. *Capital*, op. cit., p. 22.

9. E.F. Andrews, "The Monopoly of Intellect," *International Socialist Review* 1 (June 1901): 765-67.

10. May Wood Simons, "Education and Socialism", *International Socialist Review* 1 (April 1901): 600-605.

11. Leonard Abbott, "A Latter Day Brook Farm", *International Socialist Review* 1 (May 1901): 700-701.

12. William English Walling, *The Larger Aspects of Socialism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1913), pp. 272-75.

13. William Brown, "Plutocracy or Democracy", *International Socialist Review* 1 (July 1900); 13-14.

14. George Herron, "Socialism and Religion", *International Socialist Review* 1 (January 1901): 433-437.

15. Ibid., p. 435.

16. A.M. Simons, "Editorial", *International Socialist Review* 1 (November 1900): 318.

17. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*, edited and with an introduction by R. Pascal (New York: International Publishers, 1939), pp. 39-40.

18. Frederick Engels, *Introduction to the Dialectic of Nature* from Marx and Engels Selected Works Vol. 2 (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1958), pp. 75-6.

19. Louis Boudin, "The Concentration of Capital and the Disappearance of the Middle Class", *International Socialist Review* 7 (August 1906), p. 86.

20. Werner Sombart, "A Study of the Historical Development and Evolution of the American Proletariat", trans. A.M. Simons, *International Socialist Review* 7 (September 1905): 129-36.

21. Joseph Cohen, "Socialism for Students", *International Socialist Review* 9 (June 1909): 966-68.

22. Johann Most, *The Beast of Property* in Albert Fried, Documentary History of American Socialism (New York: Doubleday, 1969), pp. 213-220.

23. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, from Marx and Engels *Selected Works* Vol. 1 (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1958), pp. 34-40.

24. Ibid., p. 2.

25. Max Eastman, "Editorial", *The Masses*, December 1913.

26. May Wood Simons, "Education and Democracy", *International Socialist Review* 3 (January 1902), pp. 90-96.

27. As quoted in William English Walling, *The Larger Aspects of Socialism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1913), p. vii.

28. Karl Marx, *Criticism of the Program submitted to the Gotha Congress of 1875*, Reprinted in the *International Socialist Review* 8 (May 1908): 658-59.

29. "Consideration of the Literacy Test for the Restriction of Immigration", *New Review* (March 1913): 379-80.

30. Arthur M. Lewis, "Benjamin Kidd's Religious Interpretation of History", *International Socialist Review* 8 (February 1908): 474-76.

31. Richard M. Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), p. 115.

32. Joseph Cohen, "Socialism for Students", *International Socialist Review* 9 (June 1909): 968.

Chapter V

THE SOCIALIST VIEW OF SCHOOL AND SOCIETY: RADICAL SOCIAL CRITICISM

Floyd Dell, Socialist, accomplished novelist, playwright and managing editor of *The Masses* was also the author of an interesting dialogue in which he argued for the "new education" against an assortment of rather inadequate defenders of traditionalism. In obedience to his opinion, that education need not be "written about in a heavy, unintelligible and soporific manner", his argument resulted in the book *Were You Ever a Child?*[1] which is an interesting exposition of the philosophy and programs of progressive educators. The distinctive characteristic of Dell's writing on education is its combination of the ideas of Montessori, Dewey and Marx. This fusion of progressive educational theory with radical social criticism was typical of Socialist educational thought in the first two decades of the twentieth century. The complementary existence of these two elements in Socialist educational thought differentiates it from that of all but the most left of the liberals, for the Socialists saw the classroom not only in the perspective of the wider society, but also in relationship to the revolutionized society which they sought to bring about. Paradoxically they felt that the economic democracy which they envisaged was essential to the full implementation of progressive programs in the schools. Yet, at the same time they believed that the adoption of these programs would be an important factor in the creation of men and women with a Socialist outlook. An education whose methodology emphasized experimentation, self-reliance and the application of intelligence to social problems seemed to almost all Socialists to be

more in tune with Socialist goals as well as intrinsically superior. Traditional subject matter and methods, most Socialists thought, were too closely associated with an aristocratic past and were of dubious value in an industrialized, scientific and democratic age. Walt Mason expressed his disgust at the usual school curriculum in the following verse which was published in *The Appeal to Reason* in 1911.

> We know so much that doesn't count.
> We load up with a vast amount
> Of useless junk - of Latin, Greek,
> And tongues the dread ones used to speak.
> We learn to draw a little bit
> And then old Euclid's stuff we hit.
> We learn a string of useless dates -
> Which learning nearly busts our pates.
> And when from school we make our way,
> In this broad world to put up hay,
> We can't apply the things we've learned,
> And all our little works are spurned.
> The hopeful kids we send to school
> Will study by an iron rule.
> One may be built to twang a lyre,
> And one to stoke an engine's fire.
> One has Caruso's gift to sing,
> And one to elevate the ring.
> Whate'er the talent in the mind
> They all must try the same old grind.
> And o'er their dog-eared volumes sweat
> To learn the things they should forget.[2]

The public school in spite of its shortcomings was seen by Socialists generally as a splendid democratic achievement. Along with the roads and the postal system, the Socialist Weekly, *Appeal to Reason*,

(in attempting to convey to its readers some idea of what things would be like in a Socialist community), frequently referred to the public school as an example of a socialized institution. American Socialists were particularly proud of the secular tradition in the American public school. One of the educational causes most fervently espoused by European Socialists and reported in the Socialist journals in America was the struggle in almost every European country to wrest education from the control of the churches. This dis-establishment had been accomplished in principle, American Socialists pointed out, at the birth of the Republic. George Herron wrote that, in America people had conventionally looked upon the public school as the "kindergarten and safeguard of their liberties". The influence of Rousseau, Paine, Jefferson and Franklin had ensured that the "right to a free look at life" was asserted, and that a public life free of ecclesiastical dominance was made possible.[3] William English Walling, in a letter published in *The New Review* claimed that, although American education was still the captive of bourgeois methods of thought, matters still controversial in Britain like corporal punishment and religious instruction had ceased to be discussed long ago in the United States. It was the general Socialist consensus that free, public, secular education had been thoroughly established in principle in the United States.

In practice however, Socialists found many contradictions between this principle and the actual facts of American education. This meant that Socialists had sometimes to defend, and often to challenge, the implementation of the basic assumptions that were made about public education. Could the secular nature of public education be maintained?

How free in fact was access to public education for the working classes? Were the public schools administered for the welfare of the public or for the service of special interests?

George Herron felt that if the propertied classes had foreseen the radical effects of the public school they would never have consented to the separation of church and state but would have been anxious to retain the influence of religion in education as a means of keeping the masses in subjection to conservative ideologies. Therefore he saw as a "matter of great pertinence and importance the gradual readjustment of the public school system in accordance with the capitalist mind and psychology".[5] Those advances in human freedom which the American Revolution had accomplished and which had been incorporated into the school system were in danger of being lost in the aggressive encroachments of capitalist values upon the schools.

Whether acting as co-conspirators with capitalism or, more probably, in pursuit of quite separate religious ends, Catholics were in some places requesting the diversion of some of the public school funds to the support of religious schools. Consequently Socialist candidates for municipal offices found that they were engaged in rigorous fights as champions of the principle of public funds for public schools only. On January 30th, 1909 the *Appeal to Reason* reported that during the ten years of Mayor Rose's administration in Milwaukee only eight new school houses had been built, with the result that many children were housed in barracks where they suffered from the cold. Although in the spring of 1908 the people had voted $300,000 in bonds for school purposes the mayor wanted to spend only $120,000 of this amount for the public schools. Moreover, he had recently made

a speech at the laying of the corner stone for a new Catholic church, in which he advocated dividing the school fund between the public and the church schools. The item concluded by stating that the sixteen Socialists in the city council were making a vigorous fight for the public schools. On April 20th, 1914 the *Appeal* reported the election to the School Board, after a fierce contest, of Mrs. Victor L. Berger and Mr. Frederic Heath. At issue in the election was the question of diverting a portion of the school fund to the support of sectarian schools. The Catholic churches had distributed "dodgers headed 'Citizens Anti-Socialist Ticket'" and nearly 5000 Catholic women had appeared on election day to work against the Socialist candidates. From these incidents it would seem that Walling's contention, that the question of religious participation in public education had been solved in America, was overly optimistic. Certainly the Catholic church as well as many Protestant denominations tried hard to identify the Socialists with atheism, although most American Socialists were not hostile to religion. Clarence Meily summed up the attitude taken by Socialists towards religious observance and their determination to preserve secularism in public activities.

> The real proletarian attitude on these matters must always be, from the necessities of the case, one of perfect individual freedom and collective indifference.[6]

An issue of even greater importance because of its ubiquity was the question of freedom of access to public education. Many Socialists attributed the existence of the free public school system to the agitation of the early trade unionists in the period from 1824 to 1830. One of the dominant features of this early labor movement had been its

energetic insistence upon the provision of free educational facilities for working people. Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania and Horace Mann of Massachusetts had vigorously supported this free school principle and by the end of the nineteenth century, in the North at least, there were few children who did not have an elementary school available to their use, with its curriculum of reading, writing and simple calculation. It was the elementary school which in the early twentieth century constituted education for the mass of the people. High schools had become increasingly common, especially in the cities, since the Supreme Court of Michigan in the Kalamazoo decision of 1872 had affirmed the right of the school board to levy taxes for public high schools. But it was widely recognized that economic pressures made attendance at high school possible only for middle-class children. For the same reason colleges were also inaccessible to all except the most energetic, determined, and lucky of working-class children.

Socialists pointed out that, in spite of the popular American boast that nowhere did there exist a system of common schools equal to their own, the facts did not measure up to the claim. The facts on the contrary pointed to gross and glaring inadequacy. Scott Nearing, a Socialist, and at that time a member of the faculty of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania referred in his book, *Social Adjustment*, to the educational facts unearthed by the Census Bulletin of 1905. He reported that nearly one quarter of a million white children from 10 to 14 years of age, and born in the United States, could neither read nor write. Most were in the South but 7,799 were in the North Atlantic states and 21, 132 were in the North Central states. "The showing of child illiteracy in the United States is astonishing to the civilized foreigner", Nearing commented. The number of illiterates of all ages

compared most unfavorably with the other industrialized states of western Europe where the rate ranged from as low as 1 per 1,000 in Sweden, Germany, and Norway to a high of 58 per 1,000 in England.

> Through every state spreads this army of illiterates, presenting an unanswerable indictment of the American schools, which have fallen far below the schools of advanced Europe in that they have failed to universalize the fundamentals of education.[7]

May Wood Simons, in an article written in 1902, stated that the average schooling per individual in the United States was but four school years, although there were thousands who attended school for eight to sixteen or more years.[8] Of the sixteen million children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools not more than 650,000 were in the high schools. Scott Nearing, quoting from the 1908 *Report of the Commissioners of Education* reported that 17,373,852 children were in the elementary schools; 961,768 were in the secondary (high) schools; 149,-700 were in colleges and universities; 63,256 were in professional schools, 70,439 were in normal schools; and 727,348 were in miscellaneous schools. Somewhat less than two million children were in private schools.[9] Thus, the elementary school was the significant factor in American education at this period although the numbers reaching the high school were increasing from year to year.

Socialists had a number of explanations for the failures of the public school system. First, there were those which they attributed to the inherent abuses of the capitalist economic system. The most basic reason for the failure of the educational system was the triumph of a social order in which extremes of wealth and poverty co-existed. As Horace Mann wrote in an article, calling for a more equitable distribution of wealth

> Both the underpaid miner and the overpaid Newport pinhead who sits at a table with a maudlinly-drunken chimpanzee are an appalling reflection upon our civilization, and a single stroke of justice will abolish both, for be it known that the extravagance at Newport and elsewhere are the CAUSE of the death in the miner's cabin.[10]

The conditions of the large impoverished class of working people, the Socialists all agreed prevented them from benefitting from the existence of public schools for two major reasons. First there was the prevalence of child labor with its importance to the survival of the individual and the family. In every large city, May Wood Simons noted, teachers found the children dropping out of school at the age of ten or twelve, even where compulsory school laws existed. Even while attending school, young children of the working class were often discovered to be working from two to six hours a day out of school to help keep the family, Simons added. In the South the situation was much more serious and showed that the problem of wide-spread illiteracy was due, not so much to the large foreign population in the cities, as to native whites in the South. In South Carolina, for example, no compulsory school laws existed and children were entering the textile mills at five and six years of age. The teachers in the night schools that were provided for these little children found that all attempts at education were useless. These observations were made in 1902.[11] In 1909 conditions for these child laborers had shown no significant improvement. Jack London in his essay, *Revolution*, wrote of the 80,000 children "toiling out their lives in the textile mills of the South alone", working twelve-hour shifts and receiving, in many cases, no more than ten cents a day in wages. "All are puny wrecks, distorted, stunted, mind and body."

When these children became sick and were unable to go to work, men were employed to go on horseback from house to house to cajole and bully them into going to work.[12] The International Socialist Review printed extracts from the *Senate Report on Women and Child Wage-Earners in the Cotton Industry*. This revealed that 34.8% of the factories employed children under the legal age. "We cannot help it if the parents tell us their children are older than they are," the manufacturers retorted.[13]

The *Appeal to Reason* of November 9th, 1912 reported that two million children under the age of fourteen were working in the nation's industries. John Spargo, Socialist, in his book *The Bitter Cry of the Children* estimated that there were 2,250,000 child workers employed.[14] That the Socialists were not exaggerating the seriousness of the child labor situation, or the collusion of society in it, can be seen by the response to the problem of one of the most prestigious bodies of churchmen. In 1913, *The Masses* reported the rejection by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of a resolution condemning the employment of children under the age of sixteen.[15] The *Appeal to Reason* reported on February 12th, 1910 that Superintendant Robert I. White of the Elgin Public Schools, investigating the causes for the large number of children leaving school, found that in each case it had been found necessary for the child to quit school "to assist in the support of the family". In the southern factories the advent of the government inspectors was signalled and the children were sent running home or were hidden in closets and waste boxes.[16] North and South the employment of children was found profitable by hundreds of employers, condoned by the churches and public

officials, and made absolutely vital to survival by the poverty of thousands of families. As E. F. Andrews complained,

> Intellectual achievement is a matter of opportunity as well as ability and requires a certain amount of leisure and well-being for success. . . There is a melancholy suggestiveness in those rare instances of budding genius from the ranks of the poor that sometimes make their way into the lower grades of the common school for a few weeks and then disappear to be heard of no more. The avarice of the mill owners and the ignorance of the children's parents have thrown the better part of their lives along with the raw cotton to be ground out in the mills. . . . .[17]

Apart from this problem,Socialists protested at the poor physical condition of thousands of children who did attend school. Their weakness and hunger prevented them from learning what was available in the class rooms. A bulletin of the Bureau of Labor published in May, 1906, was examined in the *International Socialist Review.* The *Review* pointed out that the families which had formed the group under investigation had been chosen because they were headed by average working men and no intoxicants were used, namely the "respectable poor". In several instances it was discovered that the children were not permitted to go to school because they were not properly clad. Shoes, in particular, were a constant problem since they wore out and cash was needed to replace them.[18]

Another problem was the generally poor state of health of many children. The *Appeal to Reason* mentioned the problem of tuberculosis. The National Association for the Suppression of Tuberculosis had estimated that there were one million children in the public schools of the United States already suffering from this disease, who would die from it before they reached the age of eighteen.[19]

The greatest barrier to satisfactory participation in school work however was hunger. In the Socialist press dozens of news items, personal testimonies, stories real and fictitious testified to the never ending quest of the poor "to keep enough stew in the pot". The most effective Socialist argument concerning the effects of hunger upon the viability of the educational process came from John Spargo in *The Bitter Cry of the Children*. The principle that an ill-equipped teacher or classroom will prevent efficient, effective, education is well recognized, Spargo stated, but not yet understood is the futility of expecting a teacher to accomplish any meaningful educational work if the children she has in the classroom are chronically underfed. Society assumes the responsibility of educating children out of a self-interest as urgent as that which leads it to provide an army and navy. That is the fear of a devastating plague from within. Then that society must be bound to assume the responsibility for seeing that the children are in a fit state to receive some education. All the available data however show that not less than two million children of school age are victims of a poverty so desperate that they are denied the common necessities of survival, particularly adequate nourishment.[20] Typical of Spargo's findings was the one below from the city of Buffalo in New York. There in 8 schools with a total attendance of 7,500 pupils, the principals estimated that 350 or 4.46% had no breakfast at all, and that 800 more had too little to insure effective work. No less than 5,105 of the 7,500 children were reported as having tea or coffee with bread only.

> It would appear that no less than 17.33% of the total number of children are believed to appreciably handicapped by defective nutrition, and that only 16.8% are adequately and satisfactorily nourished.[21]

The lunch problem, Spargo said, was even more serious.

> Thousands of children who get some sort of breakfast, even if it is only coffee and bread, get nothing at all for lunch.[22]

And the evening meal is very often a repetition of the morning meal of bread and coffee or tea. No fact has been more thoroughly establsihed, Spargo continued, than the physical superiority of the children of the well-to-do classes over their less fortunate fellows.

> No one who has studied the matter can doubt that the physical deterioration which accompanies the impoverishment of the workers is of tremendous significance educationally.[23]

Spargo did not retreat from answering the argument that by providing food for these children through the medium of the school the society would be taking over parental functions. He asserted that all legislation relating to children--child labor laws, education, guardianship--were based upon the principle that the child belongs to society as well as to its parents, that they do not have an exclusive proprietary right to it. Moreover the assumption by the public of the responsibility for seeing to it that the children were adequately nourished had the additional benefit of preserving those among the poor who were the least likely to accept the dubious assistance of charity, that is the most self-respecting of the poor. To those who argued that the costs would be too exorbitant, Spargo replied that

> it would be far better to feed them first, neglecting their education altogether than to waste our substance on the brutally senseless endeavor to educate them while they starve and pine for bread.[24]

In "News and Views", June 1908, the *International Socialist Review* described the work of the *Committee for the Physical Welfare of School Children* inspired by *The Bitter Cry of the Children* and the research of another Socialist, Robert Hunter published in his book, *Poverty*. After having a thorough medical examination performed on some 1,400 children who were not from the poorest districts, the Committee published its initial findings. They estimated that, as well as 1,248,000 children nation-wide suffering from serious malnutrition, there were 12,000,000 in the schools who were in need of medical attention. The initial exposures of the socialists had thus led to work by a group of reformers and philanthropists that had uncovered a situation considerably more serious than Hunter and Spargo had charged. The educational implications of this situation were summed up by Austin Lewis, a left-wing theoretician of the Socialist Party who maintained that the existing economic system seriously, if not entirely, interfered with anything like a soundly organized effort at public education.

> . . . the poor physical development of the children due to underfeeding and unsanitary conditions in the tenements would of itself be sufficient to prevent the realization of the full benefit of any system of real education.[25]

Socialists were very dubious that those who had political and economic power were seriously interested in providing a worth-while public education system. William English Walling stated that "the demand for special advantages for one's own children is perhaps the last which any privileged class will abandon".[26] The children who received little or no education belonged to one class, the laboring class, Socialists insistently pointed out.

The relatively minor interest of the ruling class in education could be seen in its financing which a number of Socialist writers pointed out as comparing very unfavorably with expenditures on military expansion. This, Socialists felt, was a necessary corollary to the imperialist ambitions of American business interests. In 1909 the *Appeal to Reason* estimated that the total annual expenditure for education in the United States was about $350,000,000. Having presented the figures for the expansion of the army, navy and for military pensions, and for interest on the war debt the *Appeal* concluded that the amount spent for education was "less than that expended during 1908 on the cause of murdering the workers who produce the wealth".[27] Walling concluded similarly that "governmental expenditures on the army and navy increased far more rapidly" than the funds made available for education. Indeed Walling found that, quite apart from this revealing indication of the priorities of a capitalist society, education funds were not keeping pace with the increasing population. While $220,000,000 was spent in 1900 and $425,000,000 in 1910, a 15% increase in the pupils had also occurred during those years. At the same time it took $1.25 to purchase in 1910 what could have been obtained for $1.00 in 1900. The harsh fact was, Walling pointed out, that $4,000,000,000 was spent annually in the United States on alcohol, jewelry, automobiles and tobacco. Consumption of these items was increasing faster than expenditures on schools.[28] The implementation of a really satisfactory educational program, would depend on increasing the school budget by four or five hundred per cent.[29]

The motive of the ruling class in providing some education for the masses was one of sheer self-interest and was limited to the service of that self-interest, Austin Lewis argued in a long article on "Socialism and Education". The needs of modern capitalism called for a certain degree of literacy among the workers so that they could manage the complications of production and distribution. Further, the rise of political democracy which was a by-product of capitalism had brought about the modern political state. In America, the proclamations of political equality made the provision of some sort of public education for citizenship necessary to give validity to the rhetoric. Instead of intelligent political education in citizenship, Lewis said, the children "are put through a series of patriotic devotions which is in its ultimate the blindest of fetishism". The "little red school house" has frequently been "carried in parades like a heathen statue on a Roman holiday" such is the veneration that has been given to the public school system. But, Lewis continued, the impossibility of achieving results either in learning or citizenship in a work of such importance dependent upon a capitalist base, has led to disillusionment with the school system. This consequent loss of public confidence has in turn provided the opportunity for the public servants of the capitalist masters to advocate further restrictions in the goals of education for the masses. For example, Comptroller Grant of New York had stated, Lewis said, that a proper system of education should be restricted to sending from the elementary school "graduates having a practical knowledge of and correct use of the English language together with some knowledge of mathematics, history and geography. . .". In fact, Lewis

protested, Comptroller Grant and his supporter Chancellor Whitelaw Reid were anxious that public education should turn out "tally clerks, shop girls", and their equivalent in servitude. The training of citizens, in spite of "all the flag-flapping and patriotic genuflections" is not really a part of the capitalist scheme of education at all. The system is designed to train servants, not to educate citizens.[30]

William English Walling also commented on the non-democratic educational policies supported by distinguished educational leaders. These amounted to reinforcing existing divisions and furthering the defence of a class-structured society. Through the encouragement of these policies the denial of the benefits of civilization, and intellectual cultivation to the working class would be continued. Ex-President Eliot of Harvard, it was true, wanted to see four to six times as much money spent on the public schools to bring them up to the standards that were already supposed to be in existence, but he also had advocated in the *School Review* for April 1909 a three-class system with the possibility of advance from one system to another made easy. This, Walling pointed out, merely absorbed the cream of the working class and delayed still further the democratization of education. President Hadley of Yale, Walling charged, had shown himself even more insensitive to the interests of the working class and democratic principle. In *The Youth's Companion* of January 6th, 1910 he had recommended the German system of charging fees for high school education to eliminate those who were unwilling to pay. He had also praised the German system of enforced military service for non-high school students since it increased their efficiency as laborers. Any toleration of schemes such as

these amounted to a perpetuation of the present aristocratic system in which knowledge and intellectual development, the tools of control, remained the prerogatives of a privileged "brain" class while the masses were relegated to the functions of "hands".

As Socialists saw the situation the public functions of the school were not being promoted. The narrowest kind of patriotic parochialism was being substituted for active citizenship. Further the schools were being forced by lack of funds, and by pressures from prestigious persons unsympathetic to working class interests, to maintain narrow and inferior courses of study for the masses. These courses would give minimal academic and general education, thus training a dependent class of workers. Further, the schools entirely lacked those supportive services without which learning was impossible for large numbers of pupils. Neither the society whose public interest was supposed to be maintained, nor the individual who was supposed to be mentally nourished and developed by the public education system, were served as a result of these distortions of democratic educational purpose. The exigencies of capitalism, whose main concern for the working class was their usefulness as profit-makers, was proving inadequate to meet the human needs of the masses of the people. Austin Lewis concluded

> Briefly it appears that the educationalist must turn revolutionist and attack the economic conditions which paralyze his efforts and render abortive his attempts at reformation.[32]

NOTES

Chapter V

1. Floyd Dell, *Were You Ever a Child?* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919), p. 3.

2. Walt Mason, "Fool Knowledge", *Appeal to Reason*, 23 October 1911.

3. George Herron, "The Social Opportunity", *International Socialist Review* 4 (February 1907): 585.

4. Letter to the Editor from W.E. Walling, *New Review* (April 1915): 223.

5. Herron, op. cit., p. 585.

6. Clarence Meily, "Why the Working Man is without a Church", *International Socialist Review* 7 (February 1907): 461.

7. Scott Nearing, *Social Adjustment* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915), pp. 53-6.

8. May Wood Simons, "Democracy and Education", *International Socialist Review* 3 (January 1902): 89.

9. Nearing, op. cit., p. 314.

10. Horace Mann, "The Ideals and Shortcomings of Society", *International Socialist Review* 3 (January 1904): 473.

11. Simons, op. cit., pp. 90-91.

12. Jack London, *Essays of Revolt*, edited and introduced by Leonard D. Abbot (New York: Vanguard Press, 1924), p. 105.

13. Carrie W. Allen, "Child Slaves of the Cotton Mills," *International Socialist Review* 11 (January 1910): 521.

14. John Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1913), p. 145.

15. "Editorial", *The Masses*, December 1913.

16. Allen, op. cit., p. 522.

17. E.F. Andrews, "The Monopoly of Intellect", *International Socialist Review* 1 (June 1900): 765-66.

18. "Review of S.E. Forman's 'Living Among the Poor'", *International Socialist Review* 7 (June 1907): 718.

19. "Editorial", *Appeal to Reason*, 31 July 1909.

20. Spargo, op. cit., p. 117.

21. Ibid., pp. 83-4.

22. Ibid., p. 87.

23. Ibid., p. 100.

24. Ibid., p. 123.

25. Austin Lewis, "Socialism and Education", *International Socialist Review* 9 (November 1908): 377.

26. William E. Walling, *The Larger Aspects of Socialism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1913), p. 315.

27. "Editorial", *Appeal to Reason*, 14 August 1909.

28. Walling, op. cit., p. 316.

29. William E. Walling, Letter to the Editor, *New Review* (April 1915): 222.

30. Lewis, op. cit., pp. 373-75.

31. William E. Walling, *The Larger Aspects of Socialism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1913), pp. 309-11.

32. Lewis, op. cit., p. 378.

Chapter VI

THE SOCIALISTS, JOHN DEWEY, AND PROGRESSIVE EDUCATIONAL THEORY

During the first two decades of the twentieth century those in the Socialist movement who were interested in education and who wrote about it were almost unanimous in espousing the principles of progressive education. There was nevertheless the knotty problem of whether it was possible to effectively incorporate these progressive programs, which were essentially co-operative and critical, into the schools of a society which operated on an opposed set of values. Socialists were more willing than the other progressive educators to take this problem into consideration. This cautionary note however in no way interfered with their enthusiastic endorsement of progressive educational theory itself. Socialists were more concerned about the necessity of fighting the capitalist system on every front than other progressive educators. However they were no less equally convinced that the neotic skills that would result from the adoption of progressive education programs were essential to effective Socialist citizenship.

William English Walling said that

> several of the best known writers on educational questions are exceptionally radical and even socialistic and between them have gone to the full length of what socialism requires.[1]

The educational writings of Socialists attempted to develop a far-seeing theory of what education ought to be. Further these Socialist writers tried to demonstrate the ways in which progressive educational theories were Socialistic in their implications and intent. The task that Socialist educational writers set themselves was that of clarifying the connections between enlightened, or progressive, educational

theory and a Socialist society. The Socialists also condemned what they felt to be the anti-democratic spirit of traditional education, especially as fragments of it were applied in the elementary school which constituted "education" for the masses of the people. While, they felt, it was true that one of the characteristics of the modern period had been the extension of education to all members of society, in principle, the education thus extended had been that which had its rise among a leisure class. Oscar Lovell Triggs, member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and president of the People's Industrial College, wrote

> . . . the emphasis placed upon the mere symbols of learning, reading and writing. . . the leisure class theory of education is still in the ascendant. The people as to their industrial activities remain unserved and even unrecognized. The benefits of even the public schools accrue to an intellectual aristocracy. The divorce between the hand and the brain continue in full force.[2]

Floyd Dell explained that the belief in the popular mind about education has been that it is a kind of magic, "the black and white magic of books", and that like all magic the possession of it bequeathes a special power on its owners, lifting them above the ordinary mass of men. This power is acquired by the mastering of certain difficult and officially designated'great books' and is obtained in ever increasing quantities by stepping firmly on the various stages of the school ladder. Once acquired its owners are absolved from the usual onerous tasks that burden the ordinary man in his quest to make a living--manual, or tedious labor, or larceny. These fall to the lot of the uneducated. Thus, Dell continued, popular awe surrounded the educational process and divorced it from any association with the lives of the common people.[3]

In the classroom the children of the workers were subjected to a monotonous and dull routine of learning which made no connection with their experiences of life outside, Socialists observed. Jane Addams, who was not a Socialist but was closely united with the Socialists on a number of philosophical issues, expressed their viewpoint most succintly in this matter, as follows:

> The one fixed habit which the boy carries away with him from the school to the factory is the feeling that his work is merely provisional. . . . that the sole object of present effort is to get ready for something else. . . So, in the factory he earns his money by ten hours of dull work, and spends it in three hours of lurid and unprofitable pleasure in the evening.[4]

If education was to be related to an age of industry and made the instrument of a democratic culture accepting the present but foreseeing the future, the whole of industry and life must be brought within the scope of the educational system. Failure to do this would make for the increasing momentum of a school machine designed to serve the interest of the present ruling class by turning out fragments of men, educated to perform discrete functions in the capitalist machine--brains, muscles, hands. They would be parts in a machine over which they had no control, with which they had no moral connection because there was no social consciousness of purpose. At present, May Wood Simons wrote,

> in the hands of the ruling class the school has become a standardized institution, turning out children without greater variety than the parts of a Baldwin locomotive.[5]

This was completely antagonistic to the Socialist ideal of producing persons completely developed in every aspect of their personality. Only an education which attempted to make every individual a creative agent

in the co-operative organization of society could be acceptable to a Socialist. Interdependence should not be confused with a specialization which implied the reservation of certain functions in which all ought to participate, to special groups or classes. All should have some knowledge of where the road they were building was going, some interest in planning its direction, and a chance to travel along it.

Socialists were willing to state unequivocally that the child was not the interest of his parents exclusively, that society had a direct investment in his development. Socialists were usually ready therefore to have society intervene early in the upbringing of the child, particularly if the conditions of his home life were likely to be detrimental to his physical and moral well-being. However, social distress was neither the only, nor the most important reason for an early provision for childhood education. Early experiences in collective living and co-operative play were clearly in accordance with a philosophy which stressed working together and interdependence. Socialists were aware, too, that the importance of the early years had been given new stress by recent psychological research.

Willian English Walling called attention to the "real social enterprises" of Maria Montessori's method in which the activity of the child is the point of departure as in Froebel's kindergarten. However, Walling pointed out, with Montessori the activity is concerned with tasks in which the real usefulness is understood by the children and is unobscured by symbolism. Educational efforts, are directed in the first place at mastering the material surroundings of the child so that he becomes increasingly independent. The employment of servants for the

fulfillment of any of the tasks which the child needs to perform is persistently decried as encouraging slavish attitudes of dependence which impede self-development. Both in the insistence on mastery and in her protest against servants, "Montessori is a thoroughgoing Socialist," Walling wrote.[6] Walling approved Montessori's early introduction of the child to reading and writing when it was acquired as Montessori suggested as part of games-playing, and where interest was exhibited by the child.[7] Walling also agreed with Montessori that undue interference by the teacher, with the spontaneous activity of the child, should be discouraged as inhibiting self-direction. Walling saw Montessori's combination of school and model tenements in the "children's houses" as a long step towards the collective home. The termination of the idea of the school as an institution performing some mysterious function unrelated to the life of the community was also seen by Walling as a positive development. Although this "Children's House" had originated in Montessori's compassion for the plight of the children of the working class, whose mothers were literally torn away by the factories, Walling remarked upon the fact that Montessori had been inundated with inquiries from others who were teachers and professionals. They also clamored for a reform in their living arrangements, that would make possible a more educative form of child care for their children who, at present, had to be left with untrained maids of all work.[8] Thus, early co-operative forms of childhood education would satisfy a social need felt by all classes and indicated one of the improvements that would be made in a Socialist community.

It was John Dewey, however, whose educational philosophy expressed what most Socialists felt to be the "pedagogical revolution". Moreover, Dewey's system was most applicable to the period of elementary education which included the years when the largest proportion of the population attended school. There, as Scott Nearing said, the work of social adjustment would have to be done in the near future. Writer after writer made reference to Dewey's experimental school at the University of Chicago, and to his books. These were being published steadily throughout this period and all received enthusiastic reviews in the Socialist press. Dewey's own association with the Socialist Party was very close and, although he does not seem to have been a member of the Party itself, he was active in the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.[9] This organization was founded in 1905 for the purpose of promoting an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women, and intellectuals generally. By 1915 the I.S.S. had chapters in sixty colleges and universities. Later, during the Depression, Dewey as a member of the Thomas and Maurer Committee of Ten Thousand in 1932, and in 1936, worked actively for the election of the Socialist candidate for the presidency, Norman Thomas. In view of the high priority Dewey gave to experimentalism the doctrine of the class struggle may have deterred him from aligning himself wholeheartedly with the Socialist Party. However, there is no doubt at all of his profound distaste for, and opposition to, the ethics of capitalism. Unrestrained individualism in pursuit of economic advantage was completely contradictory to the realization of a democratic society, Dewey believed. The social Darwinist "law of survival of the fittest" which the capitalists used to justify their brutal exploitation of

people and resources was not, Dewey thought, an intelligent response to the liberation from the awful decrees of fate which Darwin's discoveries had made possible.[10] Dewey wrote of the novel, *Looking Backward*

> I wish that those who conceive that the abolition of private capital and of energy expended for profit signify complete regimenting of life and the abolition of all personal choice and emulation would read with an open mind Bellamy's picture of a socialized society.[11]

For a few Socialists, John Dewey's philosophy was as potent an influence upon their ideology as that of Marx. Max Eastman was one of these and the passage below reveals his commitment to instrumentalism, combined with his debt to Marxist thought.

> To me Socialism was not a doctrinal belief but a working hypothesis. . . Marx offered a methodology, not a blueprint. The revolution must be conducted in the spirit of experimental science, by completely flexible minds. New events, new conditions, new inventions, new ideas will enter the world in the next few years and all our plans will have to be drawn anew.[12]

Like Dewey, whose student he had been at Columbia, Eastman also believed in the redemptive powers of the "new education" for the cultivation of the democratic spirit.

William English Walling maintained that Dewey's social philosophy was completely in accord with that of the Socialists. Indeed the most positive aspect of the pragmatic philosophy was its evolutionary principle. Walling emphasized the active presence of this element in Socialist philosophy too, contending that the principles of Marxism should be in a state of constant evolution in response to the changes occurring

in the world around. Walling also predicted the imminent possibility that Socialism would be facing the paternalism of "State Socialism" or what today would be called the Welfare State, instead of private capitalism.[13]

The first principle of Dewey's philosophy, Walling thought, that had application to educational method, was his recognition that at present mankind is dominated by habits of behavior and thought which retard social evolution and prevent the reconstruction of society so that it can respond to the needs of the whole public. Dewey wrote in *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy*

> If they are to obtain more equable and comprehensive principles of action, exacting a more impartial exercise of natural power and resource in the interests of a common good, members of a class must no longer rest subject in responsibility to a class whose traditions constitute its conscience, but must be made responsible to a society whose conscience is its free and effectively organized intelligence.[14]

Walling observed in this the recognition by Dewey of the Socialist view that the morals and ideas of society are determined by its ruling class and that they are based upon a class interest, not upon rational appraisals of the welfare of all the people. Therefore these old customs and morals were undemocratic both in conception and effect.

Dewey's view of the function of education, as not only shaping the individual but equally shaping society, Walling regarded as the most socialistic element in Dewey's theory. Dewey, Walling said, considered that the school was the only place where it was possible to work for the formation of a higher type of social personality. In the social

setting of the school, in idea at least, it was possible to work free of the restrictions and compromises that characterize business, the professions and politics.

Similarly, Floyd Dell, in *Were You Ever A Child?* explained his commitment to this position taken by Dewey. He finds that the schools represent an invaluable opportunity for the child to learn democratic behavior. The properly conducted school provides associations between adults and children which are free of the emotional complexities of the home, where parents are "well meaning, bewildered and helpless people who are half the slaves of the children and half tyrants over them."[15]

Dell also rejected the authority in education which substituted the memorization of alleged facts for active thought and experimentation.

> And there is little that cannot be done by the formation of proper habits to the complete elimination of thought, the habits will even take care of the regulation of the emotions. For all practical purposes, don't you agree with me that thinking might be dispensed with?[16]

On the other hand, wrote Dell, the new education seeks to place the child at the center of the educational process providing for him "games, tools, books, scientific instruments, gardens, older persons with passionate interests in science and art and handicrafts" so that he may act freely upon these outward things to educate himself.

> For truth is reality brought into vital contact with the mind. It makes no difference whether we teach children that the earth is round or flat, if it means nothing to them either way. For truth does not reside in something outside the child's mind; reality becomes truth only when it is made a part of his living. Truths are not true because some body says so; they are true only because they fit in better with all the rest of life than what we call errors--because they bear the test of living--because they work out.[17]

Dr. Oscar Lovell Triggs published in 1913 a book, *The Changing Order, A Study of Democracy*. This book is a collection of essays and lectures delivered on cultural and educational topics before such groups as the Illinois State Teachers' Association. In the essay, "Democratic Education", Triggs also saw the school as having a crucial function in achieving social ideals. He praised John Dewey's experiment in "genuine democratic" education at the University of Chicago, explaining that

> The passage from the aristocratic, the principle of dependency and passivity, to the democratic, the principle of originality and activity was there at length completed.[18]

The school, Triggs wrote, properly organized, could provide community of interest and "freed at once from the domestic and economic environments becomes the child's true home".[19]

Another principle of Dewey's educational philosophy that was reflected strongly in the educational thought of the Socialists was his emphasis upon self-direction or shared leadership. This contrasted with the passivity, receptivity, and obedience to authority which were the characteristics of traditional education programs. These authoritarian features, Socialists had found, were further exacerbated given the economies of the usual public school. There, a "tomb-like silence was necessary where one teacher presided over classes of fifty and sixty children who were to be filled up like so many pitchers" with matter which held little interest for them as children, and had even less relevance to their lives.[20]

William English Walling thought that Dewey's emphasis on the child learning to manage and direct his own activities was intrinsic to a Socialist

education. It would prepare the workers to manage not only their own politics, but also to plan and direct the industries in which they worked. Instead of an education fitting the child to the needs of society as the existing system attempted to do, Dewey's method encouraged the adaptation of the society to human needs. These, all members of the community should be encouraged to articulate. This was exactly the aim of Socialism--to construct a rational and humane society responsive to the needs of the masses. Dewey's method was based upon the stimulation of curiosity, experimentation and problem solving in a social context. Further, by the social context, Dewey meant a cross section of society thus eliminating the idea of lower-class, middle-class, and upper-class schools, and Walling quoted from Dewey's book, *How We Think*, to demonstrate this interpretation.

> Occupations bring people naturally together in groups, develop a group consciousness and power to divide and yet to co-operate harmoniously. Knowledge, scholastic attainments, aesthetic culture, pursued as at present with only personal ends in view, tend to egoism, social stratification and antagonisms.[21]

Floyd Dell also believed that guidance in the ability to master the environment was one of the most imporatnt elements in the new education, from a Socialist point of view, implying as it did, the end of both paternalism and the exercise of controls by intellectual, economic, and political élites. In the schools, Dell urged,

> it is necessary to provide them with the real world on a smaller scale. . . a world which is theirs to observe, touch, handle, take apart and put back together again, play with, work with and become master of. . . a world from which they can go into the great world outside without any abrupt transition.[22]

May Wood Simons thought that Dewey's concept of education as a process of living and not as a preparation for future living was also the Socialist ideal. The present system, she remarked, destroys the spirit of social solidarity and mutual interest since "for one boy to assist another in his task is a thing for which to be punished". In contrast to this,Dewey's method was in accord with Socialist goals in encouraging the development of "social productive power" securing the "highest possible harmonious development of human beings".[23]

Georgia Kotsch, Secretary of the Women's Socialist Union in Oakland, California urged that teachers of children's classes in Socialism, follow the ideas of John Dewey whose theory "is directly in line with the Socialist theory that we learn by doing instead of by cramming".[24]

The central challenge to the whole educational system, however, in the twentieth century, as Socialists and Dewey saw it was to attempt to bring about a reconciliation between work, play and art. Socialists had been inspired to give thought to this difficult, and still unresolved, problem of an age of factories, mass production and division of labor, by the work of the English Socialists, William Morris and John Ruskin. Socialist interest in this was made urgent by their concern for the life of the millions who toiled long hours at low wages in the miserable environments of mines and mills. William Morris had written,

> It is right and necessary that all men should have work to do which shall be worth doing and be of itself pleasant to do and which should be done under such conditions as would make it neither over wearisome nor over anxious.

And John Ruskin, observing the effects of the division of labor upon factory workers had protested, "Life without industry is guilt, and industry without art is brutality."[25]

The process of education had become either utterly irrelevant to the work that millions would spend their lives doing, or was used as a means of possible escape from the mental and physical hardships involved in the productive work of industry. For those who actually produced the goods and resources of society there was no joy in their labor. It was a drudgery to be escaped as rapidly as possible and life was for living after work. Socialists made frequent comparisons between the monotonous, dull work demanded by the factory and the regimented routines of the public school classroom. One was presided over by a foreman, one by a teacher. All aspects of both procedures were initiated, continued and controlled by forces beyond the control of the individual. In both, the individual spirit was submerged by the demands of the process. Enjoyment, excitement, recreation, self-expression lay beyond the gates of the factory, the walls of the school. Oscar Lovell Triggs summarized the dilemma.

> Man is free politically. We have struggled with thrones and tyrannies and have won victory. We have battled with priesthood and ecclesiasticism and have gained the right of worship according to our conscience. But in the way of work, in what is for most of us most intimate, we are little better than slaves living under necessity, obeying machines, attending to masters.[26]

The problem was how to liberate body, soul and mind, or as Triggs put it, "how to make a freeman at play out of a slave at work".[27]

Everywhere, reacting to their disaffection from their work, the masses were struggling for some balance between the work they were forced to perform for wages and the opportunity to live. Essentially the demand for shorter working hours was a process without end, given the nature of the public's attitude towards industrial work. Meanwhile the ruling class was struggling to maintain a separate education for their offspring while at the same time their wealth and power rested on their ownership and profits from industry. The capitalist would be satisfied with a system of education for the children of the workers which would confine their knowledge to the machines which they were to operate. However, to prevent complete despair, before all would be kept dangling the possibility of escape into the world of the ruling class through a mastery of the traditional education.

With quite separate motives in mind both the Socialists and the capitalists wanted therefore to bring industry into the schools or the school into the factories. The capitalist wanted industrial education in the narrowest sense. The Socialists wanted industrial education included in the school program for <u>all</u>. They aimed at an integration of hand and brain, at the reconciliation of art and industry. Industrial arts, as Triggs called them, would be mastered by the child to the end that the man could control the machines for his purposes and could make them serve his creative wishes. This is what the Socialists meant by the reconciliation of work, art and play. Dell wrote,

> Play is effort which embodies one's own creative wishes, one's own dreams. Work is any kind of effort which fails to embody such wishes and such dreams.[28]

Unlike the craftsmen who built the medieval cathedrals, for example, the contemporary wage worker was not expressing himself or any inner spiritual or creative sense but was more or less unwillingly a slave of machine production. With this, he had neither significant identification nor any moral connection since the purpose of the production was outside his control and interest.

Walling asserted that this was what Dewey had in mind in his plan of education through the "social occupations", and his desire to bring the school into closer relation to the life of society as it was. With Dewey, as with the Socialists, the central purpose in introducing the machinery of industry into the school was its contribution to the full growth of the person. The acquisition of specialized skills, technical skills, was secondary to the development of a well-rounded individual. Industrial education was thus a part of general education and, as Walling quoted from Dewey,

> The study of industrial arts should develop primarily industrial intelligence, insight and appreciation, subordinating skill in manipulation to thought content. Industrial arts as a subject should incorporate all of the values of manual training, domestic art, domestic science and drawing appropriate to the elementary school and should add a rich body of thought giving them social meaning and real value.[29]

Learning to master the machine in a social context would encourage the scientific and experimental habit of testing the machine not for its monetary results but for its production of pleasure or pain.

Using the public school as a training ground for machine operatives, on the contrary, emphasized technical skills at the expense of thought and would tend to produce adjuncts for the machines, without in any way

altering the basis of control. This remained with the capitalist who owned the machine. In the capitalist plan of industrial education, in which the purpose was muscular or sense specialization, the relationship of the man with the machine remained unchanged. He continued to operate the machine in response to a need that was external to him, and unconnected with his own dream. He remained thus a drudge. He had not become a freeman engaged in creative activity with a purpose. To this notion of industrial education Dewey and the Socialists were completely opposed. Again Walling quoted from Dewey to illustrate the point.

> The ultimate value and (let us hope) destiny of the present movement toward industrial education will depend upon whether it becomes switched off into a method of class education--*in which case it would be better for it to perish immediately*--or whether it recognizes the fundamental importance of training in typical and continuous lines of activity which are of social value for everybody.[30] (Walling's italics)

Dell summarized the antagonism which arose in the social system from the alienation of the masses as a result of performing work over which they had no control, and in which they had no sense of fulfillment.

> . . . they want to be the masters and not the slaves of the machine system. And that is why, as such a hope goes glimmering they join together to wrest from their employers some control over the conditions under which they work.[31]

The capitalist however would rather lose money in strikes than concede control over the means of production, for the sense of mastery is crucial. Many workers themselves, Dell observed, prefer white collar jobs at lesser wages because this permits them the illusion of being a part of the controlling class. The end of industrial strife depends upon

the evolution of a system which can combine performance of, enjoyment in, and control over, the productive work of the community. For this the new education would prepare the children of all classes.

> . . . these young men and women who have learned to play with machinery, who know it as a splendid toy, not as a hateful tyrant--perhaps a generation of such workers, the products of a democratic and efficient educational system will have the knowledge and the power to take and use this machinery to serve their own creative dream of a useful and happy new society.[32]

The mechanisms of discipline, incentives, accountability, and testing incorporated in Socialists' proposals all departed, with varying degrees of radicalism, from the traditional methods of examination, prizes, inspection, rules and hierarchical absolutes. Socialists agreed with Dewey that incentives, derived from sources external to the child himself, subverted progressive and democratic educational principles. Following logically from the idea that real education preceded from the interaction of the child's intelligence with the natural and social environment, Socialist writers, like Dewey, felt that whether incentives were in the form of rewards or punishments they destroyed the child's incentive to undertake activities for their own sake. Rewards, no matter how humane, undermined the principle of self-motivation, and set up sources of authority extrinsic to the real intellectual center, the child's perception of necessary activity.

Floyd Dell believed that punishment should be inflicted, if necessary, by the child's peers.

> . . . the abdication of adults from the office of judge-jury-executioner of naughty children, destroys the last vestiges of the cast system

> which separates children from adults. It puts an end to superimposed authority, and to goodness as a conforming to the mysterious commands of such authority.[33]

Punishment by the child's peers, on the other hand, would place him in the same relationship to a group of equals as he would hold in adult life. It, therefore, reinforced in the child the sense of responsibility to his fellows that a Socialist civilization required.

Arthur Wallace Calhoun, Principal of the public schools in Clearwater, Florida, writing in 1912, also believed that the art of democracy that should be developed in the schools, both in spirit and in method, would be encouraged by the introduction of self-government to the students. He recommended the organization of school congresses in which each grade should have representatives. "Such a system would be a laboratory of applied democracy. . . it would go far toward making the school what it ought to be--the clearest possible approximation to the conditions of real life," he wrote. He also thought that such a scheme would go far in solving disciplinary problems caused by the autocratic system of authority. Calhoun suggested that as Socialists gained control of school boards they should seriously consider the advisability of introducing this principle of self-government into the schools under their jurisdiction.[34]

William English Walling deplored the phenomenon, familiar to all observers of the school scene, of the model student who has come absolutely under the domination of the teacher through the persuasive praise, kindness, and special favors extended by the latter. "Arranging a many sided environment for the child" was a more important function in teaching than acting upon the child directly.[35]

Socialists were inclined to take a very rosy view of the free, unshackled child. Felix Grendon, in an article on Children's Rights which reviewed Shaw's preface to his play, *Misalliance*, commented favorably on Shaw's injunction to children,

> Always contradict an authoritative statement. Always return a blow; when you are scolded for a mistake. . . return the scolding with a blow or an insult. Remember that the progress of the world depends on your knowing better than your elders.

Grendon went further than most Socialists in his demand for supportive services to the child, suggesting that the community "pay our children a dignified income from the moment of their birth".[36]

William E. Bohn deprecated the traditional method of evaluating the outcome of the education process--the examination system. If you once suppose, he said, that the purpose of an education is not to fit people to sit at desks, writing answers to questions, then the examination method becomes wholly inapplicable. . . "as ridiculous as testing a locomotive for the amount of its smoke". Bohn held, in common with most Socialists, that education had as its goal the production of men and women who could,

> think straight and think for themselves. . . with some moral backbone, people who care whether things are right or wrong. . . able to do their part of the world's work, to return to society as much as they take from it and a little more.

To discover whether the schools were producing such persons, Bohn proposed a three part evaluation. First, a kind of inspection might take place in which men and women, living among young people for a week or two, could reach a more or less accurate conclusion as to the extent to

which the characteristics described above had been developed. A second, very long-term follow up procedure, would evaluate the person twenty or thirty years after his graduation from school to see whether his formal education had led to further intellectual growth, and to the addition of new powers or the imporvement of old ones. Thirdly, the people themselves, "carpenters, street-cleaners, housewives", should estimate the progress of their children "in terms of life rather than in terms of marks and promotions", and determine how the children should be educated.[37]

Socialists were more precise than Dewey in outlining specific moral absolutes for the new education. Dewey's aversion to *a priori* judgments, and his confidence in the outcome of experimentation freely conducted, made him reluctant to impose specific principles. Like the Socialist educators Dewey located the moral purpose of education in the encouragement of rational social interaction.

> The child ought to have the same motives for right doing and to be judged by the same standards in the school as the adult, in the wider social life to which he belongs. Interest in community welfare. . . is the moral habit to which all the special school habits must be related if they are to be animated by the breath of life.[38]

Nevertheless, the perplexing dilemma remained that while co-operation and interdependence were encouraged in the school, the larger society affirmed and rewarded individual success. The Socialists definitely asserted, therefore, the necessity of positively inculcating social values in the school.

Dell believed that certain value questions needed to be applied to the enterprises that were undertaken by children. Dell pointed out that

holding up trains like Jesse James required all the ingredients of planning, co-operation, and experimentation, but was the outcome a justifiable social good? Dell therefore suggested that the following enquiries should precede the execution of any project planned. First, is the activity of a socially constructive nature? Secondly, does the projected activity interfere with the reasonable plans of others in the community? Thirdly, if the scheme conflicts with the activities of others, is it with a fundamentally altruistic intention sufficiently valid to win the others to its support?

Scott Nearing thought that children should be instructed in social morality in much the same way as they were taught individual morality.

> It is antisocial to pay low wages, and the schoolchildren should know it; it is antisocial to maintain unhygienic living conditions in the houses which you own, and the children should be told so; the working life should be long and joyous, and the schools should make this fact a part of the consciousness of every child. . . the most fundamental, far reaching, and effective work must be done by the schools--the elementary schools--because they reach all of the people and reach them when they are impressionable children.[40]

Arthur Calhoun wanted the emphasis upon personal and mercenary success, ideals that were developed in the child by the very atmosphere of the capitalist system in which he lived, to be somewhat dampened inside the school. Instead an idealism of public service should be stressed together with an awareness of the class struggle. This would create an awareness of the changes that needed to be brought about in order to achieve a genuine democracy.

> Make real to our children in all its horrors the enormity of our present economic and social system. . . let the "cry of the children" ring through the very school room. . . and fill them with the stern determination to consecrate their lives to its transformation.[41]

Oscar Triggs thought that the school's social mission included correcting the "gross egotism of youth" by inculcating principles of "mutual dependence" and a "sense of obligation".[42]

Socialists were generally less sanguine than Dewey in believing that the theories to which they subscribed were possible of realization within the context of capitalism although they enthusiastically endorsed the dissemination of the "new education" theories. Walling, in particular, warned against the capitalist "progressives" whose influence was being felt in politics and reform, but who, far from wanting any fundamental changes along the lines proposed by Socialists, were merely anxious to save the system from the most extreme of its defenders. These "progressives", in contrast to the reactionaries, were in fact the originators of those educational innovations which would tend to obscure the class nature of the present system. Only if the economic and class restrictions of the present system were removed as Dewey and the Socialists urged, would the public schools be "susceptible of revolutionary development in every direction".[43]

One note of caution should be appended in attributing to the Socialists whole hearted endorsement of the principles of the "new education". Felix Grendon, a member of the I.S.S., and a frequent contributor to the *New Review* and *The Masses* was a Socialist of English origin and had been a pupil for nine years in that country as well as a teacher in the United States. From February to June of 1915, following his review

article, "Children's Rights", Grendon carried on a correspondence with Walling on the subject of American education. Grendon agreed with many of the Socialist educational views stated above, particularly the rights of children and the inadequacies of parents as educators. He did not however share the suspicion of "great books" that Walling in common with many Socialists held. Walling thought that the literature of childhood, especially folk-lore, was unhealthy and dangerous, encouraging weird and unrealistic ideas, and that

> . . . the classical literature with which we supply our young men and women in the universities is for the same reason, in very large measure, fanciful, remote and dangerous.

Walling conceded that some works of "extraordinary power and brilliance", Shakespeare for example, should be introduced into education but only at a late stage and after careful preparation as to its reactionary nature.[44] Floyd Dell also was skeptical of what he called "Dr. Eliot's five-foot shelf" with its aura of "hereditary academic approval".[45]

Grendon, however, defended the whole body of great or classical literature, art and music, believing that it illuminated the evolution of revelation. The new religion, Grendon said, puts its God at the End of the world instead of at the Beginning. From his own experience Grendon contested the view that great literature had a reactionary influence upon its readers, and described his own revolutionary response to the Bible to illustrate his point.

> When I read the story of Eve's daring adventure in behalf of knowledge with its sequel in Adam's ignoble crying to the Lord, I became a FEMINIST. When I got to the tale of the cruel punishment God visited on Cain after first goading him to fury by mercilessly partisan discriminations, I became a SOCIALIST. When I reached the place where John the Baptist enjoins the Pharisees to look for truth in deeds not words, I became a PRAGMATIST.[46]

Socialists subscribed then to all the major elements of progressive educational theory and methodology. Socialists particularly appreciated the revolutionary implications of the undermining of traditional authoritarian elements in the educational process, and their replacement by principles of self-reliance and democratic judgment. However, although locating the source of activity and responsibility for that activity in the individual, Socialists continued to affirm the corporate nature of human experience, and purpose. Socialists were generally insistent that the inculcation of a sense of social responsibility should be a matter of direct instruction as well as being forwarded through the co-operative activities of the class room. Socialist writers also sought to extend the educational process into direct and continuous contact with scientific, industrial and technological realities. Their goal was to subject these powerful giants which determined life-styles in the industrial age to the understanding and control of the masses of the people.

NOTES

Chapter VI

1. William E. Walling, *The Larger Aspects of Socialism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1913), p. 257.

2. Oscar Lovell Triggs, *The Changing Order, A Study of Democracy* (Chicago: Charles Kerr and Co., 1913), p. 250.

3. Floyd Dell, *Were You Ever a Child?* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919), pp. 36-53 passim.

4. Jane Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1902), p. 191.

5. May Wood Simons, "Building a New School System", *Coming Nation*, 10 June 1911, pp. 3-4.

6. Walling, op. cit., pp. 258-59.

7. Ibid., p. 280.

8. Ibid., pp. 369-70.

9. The relationship of John Dewey to Socialism is an intriguing one. Apart from his membership in the Intercollegiate Socialist Society Dewey was active in the League for Industrial Democracy and in the attempts to elect Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate to the Presidency of the United States, both in 1932 and in 1936.

10. See John Dewey, *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy*, (New York: Holt and Co., 1910).

11. John Dewey, "A Great American Prophet", as quoted in Albert Fried, *A Documentary History of American Socialism* (New York: Doubleday Co., 1969), p. 256.

12. Milton Cantor, *Max Eastman* (New York: Twayne, 1970), p. 109.

13. Walling, op. cit., pp. 27-29.

14. John Dewey, *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy*, as quoted in Walling, op. cit., pp. 226-27.

15. Dell, op. cit., p. 169.

16. Ibid., p. 140.

17. Ibid., p. 151.

18. Triggs, op. cit., p. 178.

19. Ibid., p. 173.

20. May Wood Simons, "Education and Democracy", *International Socialist Review* 3 (January 1902): 195.

21. As quoted in Walling, op. cit., p. 275.

22. Dell, op. cit., pp. 25-26.

23. May Wood Simons, "Education and Socialism", *International Socialist Review* 1 (April 1901): 604.

24. Georgia Kotsch, "News and Views",*International Socialist Review* 9 (April 1909): 819.

25. As quoted in Triggs, op. cit., pp. 160-62.

26. Triggs, op. cit., p. 157.

27. Ibid., p. 162.

28. Dell, op. cit., p. 92.

29. As quoted in Walling, op. cit., p. 284.

30. John Dewey, *Progressive Journal of Education* (February 1909) and quoted in Walling, op. cit., pp. 274-75.

31. Dell, op. cit., p. 92.

32. Ibid., pp. 94-95.

33. Ibid., p. 177.

34. Arthur W. Calhoun, "Schools for Democracy", *The Masses*, May 1912.

35. Walling, op. cit., p. 227.

36. Felix Grendon, "Children's Rights",*New Review* (April 1916): 95.

37. William E. Bohn, "What Kind of Education?" *New Review* (April 1916): 113-15.

38. John Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education*, as quoted in Walling, op. cit., p. 266.

39. Dell, op. cit., pp. 157-166 passim.

40. Scott Nearing, *Social Adjustment* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915), p. 321.

41. Arthur W. Calhoun, "Schools for Democracy", *The Masses*, May 1912.

42. Triggs, op. cit., p. 173.

43. Walling, op. cit., p. 318.

44. Ibid., p. 318.

45. Dell, op. cit., p. 62.

46. Felix Grendon, "Letter to the Editor", *New Review* (May 1915): 46.

Chapter VII

THE SOCIALIST CRITICISM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The American Socialist Party had a very large proportion of members who were neither proletarian in their work nor, in many cases, in their origins. Journalists, lawyers, teachers, and ministers, in particular were professionals who had a disproportionately large representation in the party. The influence of these intellectuals as propagandists and officers in the Party was even greater than their numbers. This situation in a party whose purpose was the elevation and involvement of the masses, gave rise to a great many interesting exchanges on the nature of intellectuals and the institutions of higher learning which produced them. Both were critically appraised for their possible attributes or defects, as catalysts of Socialist revolution, and as servants of the masses.

Robert Rives La Monte, an associate editor of the *International Socialist Review* said that there were two types of intellectuals in the American Socialist Party

> The eager youthful American, convinced that Marx was outgrown, avid for the creation of a New American Socialism, and the equally eager, usually foreign young student of Marx whose culture was narrow and more or less barren, because he was as truly a one book man as was the Seventeenth century Puritan of Cromwell's army.[1]

Whether this distinction was as clear as La Monte suggested seems doubtful. Marx was rarely ignored and Socialists who had been born abroad were, if anything, more acutely aware than the native born of the differences between the European and American experiences. Socialist Party intellectuals sought with varying degrees of resourcefulness to find both in Marx, and in relation to capitalist realities in America,

definitions of intelligence and intellectuality acceptable to Socialist ideology that would not be tied to the mere possession of a college degree. All agreed that the real revolution would be based upon the development of the consciousness of the industrial proletariat. Some Socialists argued that intellectuals were brain workers, and were a part of the proletariat. Thus F.J. Maxwell, in a letter published in the *International Socialist Review* in 1907 wrote,

> As I said before I am not a coal miner. . . yet for many years have worked for wages and earned my living as a bookkeeper and feel that I am as much entitled to be called a proletarian as our comrade who is a coal miner.[2]

Carl D. Thompson, one of the former ministers in the Socialist Party and a director of its bureau of information held a similar view.

> A third section of the proletariat and one that has always played a very decided part in the development of the Socialist movement has been called the intellectual proletariat. These are the educated men and women in the schools, colleges, universities, arts and sciences who find their field of employment constantly restricted and hemmed in. . . . They do not own the means of their employment. They belong technically and in practically every sense of the word to the proletariat.[3]

In 1912, Barnet G. Braverman, commenting on the conditions of professionally trained persons also identified this group as proletarians. The country, he said, was "overcrowded with doctors, lawyers, professors, teachers, and scientists who were competing against each other in the struggle for jobs and bread.

> The college trained proletarian is becoming conscious of his identity of interests with his fellow workers who never had the opportunity to enter a university.[4]

In 1908 Henry Flury, President of the University of Pennsylvania Socialist Society said that, forced by economic pressures, workmen and small business men were sending their sons to college. He also noted that engineering and scientific education showed a phenomenal growth in enrollment compared to purely cultural and classical education. However, in spite of the great burden and financial sacrifice involved in this attempt to prepare for the vicissitudes of a capitalist economy, Flury warned that

> The engineer - civil, electrical, chemical, mining or mechanical; the chemist, the physician, the dentist, the lawyer and the teacher will find in the very near future, if not at present, that unemployment is not a condition confined solely to unskilled workers, but a condition existing in the professions as well.[5]

Flury referred to the census of 1900 to prove that unemployment in the professions had risen by 11.2% since the census of 1890. He calculated that the census of 1910 would show a professional unemployment rate of about 40%. "The law of the jungle prevails among college men just as inexorably as among unskilled laborers", Flury observed. He predicted that Socialism would become, therefore, a movement of intellectual as well as physical workers.[6]

More difficult to resolve than the question of whether intellectuals could be identified as proletarians was the problem of the role of intellectuals in the Socialist Party. This arose from the tendency of the intellectuals to assume positions of leadership and to dominate the Party councils. Since in these years the Socialists thought that they would soon attain power in America, this problem was widely discussed. It is indicative of a significant contradiction in Socialist educational

thought. How can a high quality of mental activity be cultivated without simultaneously creating an elite of leaders and bureaucrats? There was also the doubt as to whether the existing institutions of higher education were conducive to the development of a Socialist intelligence. The discussions of these issues reveal the ambivalence, at best, that Socialists felt towards the universities, their programs, and their graduates.

Victor L. Berger, the Socialist congressman and leader of the Milwaukee Socialist Party wrote,

> I, for one, gladly welcome the collegiate Socialists. We need the help and goodwill and co-operation of the college man and woman to solve the greatest question of the day, the social question. . . from the trained scholastic mind of the college man we have a right to expect valuable help in solving the questions of the day.[7]

Carl D. Thompson declared that when Socialists shouted the shibboleth, "Workers of the World Unite", they did indeed mean all those who worked, or wanted to, for wages and salaries.

An editorial in the New York Socialist newspaper, *The Call* favored the welcome and assimilation into the Party of widely divergent elements. Although the Socialist Party was first and foremost the party of the workers, "it had room and a warm welcome for the millionaire and parlor Socialists too". And not forgetting the graduates the editorial continued, benevolently,

> Aye, it has room for intellectuals - such intellectuals are sure of a hearty welcome in the party of the proletarians whose aim it is to make every worker an intellectual.

Charles Dobbs, in a short essay *Brains* asserted that even after removing the whole mass of "false and mischievous error" that characterized much of the curriculum in educational institutions there still

remained a "certain residuum of positive knowledge which is the common heritage of all mankind." Dobbs felt that the education which made a person an intellectual was as valuable, and sometimes, more valuable than the equipment which enabled men to run engines or harness nature in the service of man. Marx, Dobbs said, had distinctly set forth the idea that the man who works with his brain performs useful labor in society.[9]

To La Monte, however, it was "a highly fallacious assumption that the possession of a conventional bourgeois education is a guarantee of the sort of mental efficiency the Socialist Party needs." The important thing to understand, in La Monte's opinion, was that no one by reason of his privileged educational background should assume the possession of effective intelligence. Victor L. Berger, a lawyer himself was nevertheless cautious about collegians. He commented that it often took more brains to put together and run a machine than it did to run a banking institution or to be president of a college.

A.M. Simons tried to strike a balance between attributing too much deference to intellectual training and paying too little respect to the disciplined study of fundamental ideas.

> No one can have a greater contempt for the college diploma than we have, for we have seen how frequently it is but a certificate of misinformation and a testimonial that the owner was so thoroughly impregnated with capitalist psychology as to be absolutely incapable of ever understanding any philosophy not based on that psychology. All too frequently we have seen men of whom we have had the greatest hopes that they might become active workers in the cause of the proletariat become absolutely confused by university instruction.

But Simons emphasized that it would be just as foolish to go to the other extreme and condemn utterly the capitalist educated intellectual.[12]

The suspicion of the motives of the intellectual element in the Socialist Party had been fueled by some of the critical theoretical writings of the European disciples of Marx. Their works frequently appeared in translation in the pages of the *International Socialist Review*, particularly while A.M. Simons was editor. Engels warned of the crowd of students who

> regard the bourgeois university as a sort of Socialist Saint-Cyr which gives them the right to enter the ranks of the party with the title of officer if not general.[11]

Karl Kautsky admonished Socialists to be wary of those intellectuals who sought in the Socialist movement the successes and prestige that the capitalists had denied them instead of participating in the class struggle. Such persons, Kautsky said, were a poor acquisition and could become an impediment to the achievement of Socialism. August Bebel said

> Test new comrades well but test the intellectuals two or three times.

Either from his experiences with some of the members of the American Socialist Party or perhaps because of his close association with the *Industrial Workers of the World*, William Haywood shared these misgivings about intellectuals. He confined his definition of the proletariat to industrial workers. He declared,

> I would rather spend fifteen years winning one wage worker to the army of the Revolution than one day in converting a professional man.[13]

Socialist intellectuals themselves were often the most vociferous in their denunciations of the effects of being educated in the established

institutions and were often the most sanguine believers in the superior revolutionary potential of the proletariat.

La Monte's doubts about the efficacy of "conventional bourgeois education" was a view that was not confined to Socialists, he said. Scepticism had been expressed also by that arch-individualist H.L. Mencken. He had declared that school teachers were probably the "most ignorant and stupid class of men in the whole group of mental workers," and that unfortunately a measure of their stupidity was undoubtedly passed on to their students. La Monte suggested that these "fallacies, delusions, imbecilities" described by Mencken should make suspect any attempt to equate learning with intelligence. The only valid criterion for judging "efficient brains" is the power to serve the working class, La Monte wrote. Wherever these kinds of brains were found, in the "skull of a professor or a coal-heaver", they should be utilized in the service of Socialism. But, La Monte declared,

> The modern Socialist knight who lacks faith in the proletariat will never draw the sword "excalibur" from the rock. He is marching into battle unarmed.[14]

The early French Socialist Proudhon described the relationship between experience, physical labor and intellectuality as compared with the duly certified product of the capitalist university, which seemed to fit the ideal of most American Socialist critics of education.

> There are amongst the working masses plenty of educated men capable of writing as well as talking, informed on business matters, more capable and worthier representatives, . . . than the lawyers, journalists, writers, pedants, intriguers and charlatans on whom the working men lavish their votes. . . .[15]

This ideal was incarnated in the Socialist hero, Ernest Everhard of Jack London's novel, *The Iron Heel*. Here was portrayed the most

desirable kind of party worker, organizer and theoretician, the educated proletarian, not the 'intellectual' leader of the proletariat.

A cartoon in the *Coming Nation* shows three black-gowned and very ancient professors, each labelled respectively TRADITION, CONSERVATISM, OBSOLETE TEXT-BOOKS. The caption underneath reads, "The faculty in a Capitalistic College."[16] This portrayal is a very rough summary of the reflections of Socialists on the character of the American university during the first two decades of the twentieth century. As Socialists saw it, the universities and colleges, more than any other part of the educational system, were financed directly by contributions from capitalists. Charles Edward Russell, the muck-raking journalist who had joined the Socialist Party in 1908 and who became the editor of the *Coming Nation*, said that the university was the "hot bed of snobbery, the bulwark of reaction and the fountain head of snobbery and pharisaical, smug-faced reform." Russell went so far as to predict that the American university was one of the worst evils of the capitalist system with which the Socialists would have to deal when the showdown came.

> How can you expect anything else when our universities are financed by Rockefellers, Archbolds, Amason Stones and Ryans, and when they are conducted by men like old Fog Horn Day and Nicholas Murray Butler?

Particularly illustrative of the sordid, even immoral value system of these institutions was the fact, according to Russell, that of the young men entering the Wall Street gambling dens, the brokers' offices, fifty percent were univeristy graduates. These remarks were contained in an editorial written in January of 1911. Feeling against the universities or their graduates must have been running high that year, around Girard,

Kansas, at any rate, because in a column "Intellectual Prostitution", the *Appeal to Reason* also blasted "lackey-artists, lackey-writers, lackey-lawyers and lackey-intellectuals." These, the columnist stated, were the genuine enemies of progress who lent their large capacities to erect more effective barricades against the people's "rightful inheritance of culture and happiness."[18]

Writing in 1900, William Brown admitted that plutocracy had been powerfully instrumental in the development of the resources of the earth and in sharpening the mind in certain directions, but asserted that it was becoming more and increasingly evident that many lines of human development were impossible under its control. Truth could only be discovered if men were perfectly free to investigate and publish the results of their research. Unfortunately, Brown said, it was a well understood principle in the universities that the teaching of economics had to be in harmony with the interests of capitalism.

A.M. Simons, in an editorial written in 1903, commented on the extraordinary ignorance of Socialism that prevailed in scholastic circles. Acquaintance with classes in economics and sociology in any great university would reveal that much time was given to the theories of the physiocrats, for example, or to theories of rent, interest, wages and profits completely abandoned in all but scholastic circles, and yet the vast majority of university curricula failed to mention Socialism at all. Even if Socialism were the craziest of theories the very fact that it was already the working philosophy of over thirty million people would warrant giving some attention to its basic theories. Simons had found in lecturing before students at the Universities of Chicago,

Wisconsin and at Harvard that only a handful of students among hundreds who claimed that they had studied Socialism, had heard of the *Communist Manifesto* for example.

> In the scope of [this] small pamphlet, endorsed by hundreds of Socialist organizations, circulated during a half century by millions of copies in every known language, these fundamental principles of Socialism are set forth in words no one can well misunderstand. Surely, even if such a pamphlet were filled with the veriest nonsense it would merit attention because of its vast circulation and influence.

Henry Leffman, one of the most prominent scientists in Pennsylvania, in an article entitled, *The Capitalist Control of Education* compared the donations made to universities in the twentieth century with the endowments made by the powerful in the Middle Ages for chantries and churches. Then the ruling class sought, by buying so many Masses, to protect themselves from future justice whereas the present ruling class hoped by their donations to educational institutions to secure themselves in the present by controlling knowledge in the service of their interests. Leffman exemplified this by referring to the terms of the endowment of the Wharton School of Finance and Economy at the University of Pennsylvania. The donor of the original gift of about $100,000 had acquired a considerable part of his fortune in the manufacture of metallic nickel under a protective tariff. Certain general principles were laid down by the founder to be followed in the teachings of the Wharton School. Among these was the following

> the necessity for each nation to care for its own, and to maintain by all suitable means its industrial and financial independence; no apologetic or merely defensive style of instruction must be tolerated on this point, but the right and duty of <u>national self-protection</u> must be firmly asserted and demonstrated.

It was not only in the fields of economics and sociology that Socialists charged intellectuals with subordinating the pursuit of truth to capitalist pressures. Adam Israeli, in an article, "Capitalist Science" described the biases displayed by medical journals. He referred to an editorial in *American Medicine*, April 1907, which asserted that the Negro brain had been found to be considerably smaller than the brain of the European, particularly that of the Anglo-Saxon. The article then went on to recommend that anatomy be put to the service of statesmanship and that the franchise be limited to the big brains. Israeli noted that just as Providence was usually found on the side with the big guns, so expert scientists were usually found on the side that could afford the fattest fee. Israeli charged that the accredited representatives of a science that was under the influence of capitalism was hardly a reliable court of appeal for determining scientific truth let alone a fit judge as to qualifications for exercising the right to vote.

Henry Leffman also drew attention to the role of scientific journals as moulders of public opinion in technical and scientific areas. He found that these journals were almost entirely under the control of big companies as a consequence of the support that was derived from their advertising. Even where important issues of public welfare were involved, no serious opposition to these powerful interests could be expected. Leffman, in an early appeal for the control of pollution noted that the *Chemical Engineer* made light of these problems. Even where questions of injury to the health and comfort of the people had been raised, as in the ruin of farm lands by smelting operations, the *Chemical Engineer*'s response was sarcastic regarding the public welfare, and duly submissive to the company interest.

> A great deal of maudlin sentiment has been directed against the destruction of a few fish by wood pulp mills, and while the fish are no doubt less harmful and more useful than some of the newspapers which are printed on the product of these same mills. . . it is only a question of time before the fish go anyway, sulphite or no sulphite.

In such terms, Leffman protested, the professional journals made light of vital public concerns to the advantage of the profit makers. The combination of the owners and editors of scientific and technical journals with the administrators and professors in higher institutions resulted in a complete unavailability to the public of viewpoints which challenged orthodox views on economic organization. These, set forth in both lecture halls and journals, of course vindicated the priorities, economic and societal, of the capitalistic philosophy.[23]

Another reason for the hostility of Socialists to the university can be illustrated from the well-known remark of William Rainey Harper, first President of the University of Chicago.

> It is all very well to sympathize with the working man, but we get our money from those on the other side, and we can't afford to offend them.[24]

Professors who were bold enough to criticize contemporary economic and social arrangements, even to the extent of what today seems like rather mild liberal dissent were liable to find themselves abruptly dismissed from their posts. As an editorial in the *Appeal to Reason* expressed it,

> the man whose brain will work outside the grooves set for it by capitalist society finds himself a man without a country and without the privilege of living even when he is willing to work.[25]

There were indeed a succession of incidents in which men otherwise able and even brilliant in the performance of research and teaching appear to

have been removed for criticizing existing economic arrangements or, in at least one case, for openly acknowledging membership in the Socialist Party. Looking, in chronological order, at the cases that particularly aroused Socialist ire, it can be seen that academic freedom did not extend to the airing of heretical views on the infallibility of the capitalist system.

Edward Bemis' removal from the faculty of the University of Chicago for his attack upon the conduct of the railroads during the Pullman Strike did, in fact, lead the *Chicago Journal* to describe the desirable conduct for faculty members who were discreet. The *Journal* declared that the pursuit of truth was not the duty of a salaried university professor. It was, on the contrary, his business to teach established truth.

In 1899 George Herron offered his resignation to the trustees at Grinnell College, trusting that it would not be accepted. The Board of trustees, however, seized the opportunity to be rid of a controversial presence on the campus. Although the situation was complicated by Herron's relationship with Carrie Rand and his criticism of marriage as a coercive institution, Herron and other Socialists believed that the basic reason for the acceptance of his resignation was his Socialist commitment. Herron stated that the facts surrounding his resignation made it impossible for anyone to believe that freedom of teaching existed in institutions of higher learning.[26]

In 1901 Socialists attributed the reorganization that affiliated the Emmons Blaine School of Pedagogy with the University of Chicago, to an attempt to degrade the work of John Dewey. As a result of the changes Dewey was to be relegated to a subordinate position and his model school disbanded, according to an article by A.M. Simons, in the *International*

Socialist Review. The *Review* was not surprised to learn of this development in regard to Dewey's experiments because

> accepting the full logic of his philosophy he has pointed out its sociological relations and close connection with the doctrines of Socialism. Such a man whether consciously or unconsciously is most effectively propagating Socialism. Indeed there is today no field more full of promise of revolutionary action than that of education.[27]

In 1901 also, Socialists were deploring the dismissal of Professor E.A. Ross, a sociologist from Stanford University. Ross had publicly and in the classroom expressed his disapproval of coolie labor, a position which apparently did not endear him to Mrs. Leland Stanford. The result was that President Jordan had seen fit to discharge Ross. Socialists were pleased to observe in connection with this incident of "contemptible toadyism" to capitalism that the American Economic Association, which was the closest approach yet to a trade union among professors, had intervened with a "somewhat pedantic document" exonerating Ross. The *International Socialist Review* also reported the resignation of three professors who refused to step into Ross's shoes, the discharge of another professor who championed Ross and a large body of students who spoke in behalf of Ross. Regrettably, the *Review* had also to observe that the university had experienced no difficulty in securing scabs to take the place of the professors who had been dismissed.

In 1911 the State University of Florida forced the resignation of history professor, Arthur W. Calhoun. The *Appeal to Reason* reported that Professor Calhoun was a Socialist and his resignation was demanded for that specific reason. Calhoun was given the alternative of abandoning his views on the subject of Socialism or surrendering his job. Letters on his behalf described him as "the most devout Christian on the faculty",

and testified to the fact that his teaching was "constructive not destructive." But these did not alter the course of events.[28] Three years later, when he was Professor of Sociology and Economics at Maryville College, Calhoun wrote an article, "Academic Slavery", which reflected on his experiences as a Socialist academic. He wrote,

> Some of us think that we know as much what slavery means as does the man in the ditch. We have less trouble in keeping our hands clean and our shoulders straight, but find it just as hard to keep our souls clean and our spines straight.

A man could be the most brilliant teacher, Calhoun said, but if he gave free rein to his judgment on matters of social and economic policy he would be unable to keep his job. The result was mental servitude. From his own experiences Calhoun recalled that if an academic made a public address on Socialism the yellow press insinuated that "he spends his vacations with the comrades". Even if a Socialist academic were a member of the most conservative church in Christendom he would be stigmatized as an infidel or atheist, if he ventured to display his colors as a Socialist, Calhoun complained. He asserted that the opponents of Socialism and social criticism had developed a philosophy of classroom behavior to rationalize the silencing of expressions of dissent. These opponents had determined that no feelings should be injected into the classroom; that the professor must not be an advocate; and that the professor should not exercise any influence over tender minds. Calhoun compared these rules which were to apply to teaching in the fields of economics, history and sociology with the teaching of art and literature where critical value judgments were made as part of the educational process.[29]

In 1915, early in June Scott Nearing closed his Wharton School desk at the University of Pennsylvania and moved to Arden, Delaware for the summer. On June 16th, he received a letter from the office of the Provost.

> As the term of your appointment as assistant professor of Economics for 1914-15 is about to expire I am directed by the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania to inform you that it will not be renewed.
>
> With best wishes, I am,
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> Edgar Fahs Smith[30]

Nearing had been extremely active in the fight against child labor. As well as publishing and speaking against this practice he had gradually collected and amassed documentation to demonstrate that private enterprise capitalism was unethical and anti-social in its behavior and consequences. According to Nearing's own account he had been summoned to Dean James T. Young's office and had received the following advice, "Mr. Nearing, if I were in your place I would do a little less public speaking about child labor." Other colleagues and friends, like Professor William Lingelbach of the History department, had also suggested

> Go on with your teaching, collect your salary. Take your promotions as they come along; bank your royalty checks. Keep your mouth shut on these controversial issues.[31]

The exact reason for Nearing's precipitate dismissal is not absolutely clear, even today, he writes, but it was apparently connected with just that oligarchical power exerted over the university by capitalists that Socialists deplored. A prominent millionaire in the State Republican machine was said to have made it known to the University of Pennsylvania authorities that if they wanted the one million dollars appropriation

for the University to get through the legislature they had better get Nearing off the payroll. In spite of the advances in academic freedom that the adverse publicity surrounding the Nearing case brought about, Nearing himself, in spite of his brilliant promise and the efforts of sympathetic colleagues was not invited to join the faculties of any of the leading universities. Instead he accepted an appointment at the University of Toledo where a Socialist trustee, Dr. John S. Pyle, a wealthy surgeon, and patron of the University had been responsible for inviting Nearing.

These, then, were the cases most widely commented upon in the Socialist press, because the victims either were Socialists or held views that were opposed to the dominant economic powers of that period. There seems to be little evidence against the Socialist contention that learning freely, teaching freely and applying knowledge to the amelioration of the conditions of the masses was seriously hampered by the fear of capitalists that certain viewpoints, widely disseminated or accorded more cogency when uttered by professors, would indeed imperil the freedom of businessmen to accumulate wealth and to exercise unimpeded political power.

There were, nevertheless, occasional small victories for the Socialist side. In 1911, the *Appeal to Reason* commented on an item in the *Evening News* of Pensacola, Florida. The *News* was very much disturbed by some contest orations that its reporter had heard at the Florida College for Women. At least two of these speeches "would have made Debs ashamed of himself", the *News* lamented. It went on to deplore the courses in political economy and sociology that were leading the college to turn out "Socialists by the classfulls." The *Appeal* was

pleased to see the Institutions at Tallahassee fulfilling their legitimate mission in "forwarding the cause of real democracy" by encouraging the people to explore new thoughts and ideas.

In 1903 the *Coming Nation* was pleased to report the resignation of the Reverend D. Taylor from Vassar College because "he could no longer endure the growth of radical and woman suffrage sentiment among the students of that institution."[34]

Occasionally there was praise for the work of the universities from Socialist sources, as well as suggestions for the direction that its work should take in order to serve the public. The University of Wisconsin was praised by A.M. Simons for being closer to the people's interest than any other educational institution in America. Wisconsin had made available to the public the findings of its legislative research bureau, the services of trained lecturers and skilled teachers for trade schools. Socialists had made use of University of Wisconsin experts in establishing social centers, playgrounds, trade schools, and engineering services during their administration of the municipality of Milwaukee.[35] In 1912 readers of the *Appeal* were urged to demand that their own state universities provide similar research and extension teaching services since the University of Wisconsin had been inundated with requests for information and help. The *Appeal* also suggested that the state universities provide lectures on scientific subjects, particularly in country towns where life was "intellectually flat" and a "mental desert." The people the *Appeal* believed, would respond to intellectual activities initiated under the auspices of the state universities. The work of the agricultural departments of these universities had inspired a measure of public confidence in them among rural people.

If it was difficult, if not impossible, for Socialist faculty to reconcile their own values with the realities of power within the university, students by the score and then by the hundreds joined the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. The ISS was founded in 1905. Even earlier, in 1900, Socialist students from Harvard, Columbia, Brown and Chicago had been present at the International Congress of Socialist Students held at the Hotel Des Sociétes Savantes in Paris. By 1913 the ISS was strong enough to afford the publication of a quarterly magazine, the *Intercollegiate Socialist*. Ernest Poole, the esteemed author of the Socialist novel, *The Harbor*, reported on the state of the ISS in 1912 in the *Coming Nation*. The membership totalled 800 students in 41 chapters. There were, in addition, 5 alumni chapters with a total membership of 350. The largest chapters were at Harvard, Yale and Wesleyan (the college of Harry W. Laidler, for many years the ISS secretary and organizer), with 50 to 60 members in each chapter. Next came Cornell, Columbia, Barnard, Wisconsin, and Michigan where the memberships were between 20 and 40 per chapter. There were also fraternal delegates in many other colleges where no branch organizations existed. A full account of the activities of the ISS needs further research and its activities can only be briefly indicated here. Debates were organized like the one at Wisconsin in 1907 where the university Socialists were victorious in moving, "That the gradual introduction of Socialism would subserve the best interests of the people."[38] Sometimes ISS chapters became engaged in activist struggles in behalf of students' rights. Frank Bohn, an associate editor of the *International Socialist Review* and contributing editor of the *Masses* reported on a hunger strike at the University of Michigan in 1914. This strike protested the

starvation wages paid to students who were forced to work to support themselves.

> Hundreds of students were working from four to six hours a day in kitchens, dining rooms and offices. Most of them worked for their meals. . . others tended a furnace for twenty four hours a day for the privilege of sleeping in the attic..

Clean food and reasonable working hours were demanded by these students who had been organized into a union by the ISS chapter. Boarding houses and restaurants were picketed. The strike was splendidly successful, both as educational propaganda and for its achievement of material benefits, Bohn wrote. He congratulated the Michigan chapter on its graduation into "long trousers." Bohn theorized that the activities of the Michigan ISS had involved the students in the class struggle providing them an education in the conflict between workers and exploiters.[39]

Meanwhile other students acted to force the universities to introduce courses that they wanted. For instance the *Appeal to Reason* reported that in 1911 a course in Modern Socialism had been started at Harvard with an enrollment of thirty students. This had resulted from the circulation of a petition requesting the establishment of such a course which had gained over 500 signatures in the previous academic year.[40]

Socialist grievances against instructional processes and the senility of the classical curriculum were relatively few. Most were in the form of occasional scornful remarks or cartoons. However, an article, "The Relation of Instructors and Students," by Harlow Gale deplored the failure to review the relevancy of traditional subjects and the efficacy of the old methodology. Gale, whose article was originally published in the *Minnesota Magazine*, felt that the attitude of antagonism

that prevailed between undergraduate students and their professors was due to two factors. First, there was the continued presence in the curriculum of subjects such as Latin, Greek, and Metaphysics, which were perceived by students as being of dubious value in the modern world of industry and science. Secondly, these subjects and others of more certain utility and interest were, more often than not, taught by methods which derived their validity from Puritan asceticism. Instead of using observation and the inductive method by which real as against verbal knowledge is obtained, too many teachers continued to operate on the pleasure-pain principle. If the learning of a subject were made as difficult as possible, then those who subjected themselves to the pain of learning it would be doubly rewarded by acquiring not only the knowledge itself but also a disciplined mind. On the basis of this obsolete logic, Gale continued, astronomy, for example, became a grim perusal of logarithm tables instead of a close observation of the "marvelous stars." Meanwhile pleasure matched with learning was regarded by traditionalists as an indulgent lapse into original sin, by the defenders of the traditional disciplinary studies.[40]

Socialist dissatisfactions with the American university and college led to a number of attempts to organize alternative institutions of higher learning. Socialists were particularly anxious to free the social studies from the strictures imposed by the need to maintain a capitalist line of interpretation. In spite of some corruption, Socialists seemed to feel that the work done in the physical sciences and in technical fields was less susceptible to distortion and bias. As one writer remarked,

> Nearly all of the fruits of scientific investigation are of especial value to the working class in their struggles for better conditions.[42]

Practically, too, the task of reproducing the laboratories and facilities that were essential to research and studies in science and technology would have imposed an impossible strain upon Socialist finances.

The two centers of attempts to organize alternative institutions were in New York and Chicago. In New York, the trustees of the Rand Fund which had been donated by George Herron's mother-in-law, were charged with establishing a school to teach social science from the standpoint of International Socialism. The trustees, in turn, empowered the American Socialist Society, an incorporated body formed in 1901, to found and maintain such a school. Thus, in 1906, the Society leased a building at 112 East Nineteenth Street and prepared to begin classes on October 1st. Instructors were to be paid and moderate tuition fees were charged to the students. The President of the School was Algernon Lee; Morris Hillguit was the treasurer and W.J. Ghent, the secretary. A plan of the courses tentatively offered for the opening session of the School is given below.

> Systematic courses, with the use of text-books, personal assistance of instructors, examinations, and seminars on
>
> 1. Elementary Socialism
> 2. Economics of Socialism
> 3. History of Socialism
> 4. Nature and Functions of the State
> 5. Composition and Rhetoric
>
> Lecture and Conference Courses, with opportunity for questioning instructors, on
>
> 1. Principles of Sociology
> 2. Ethics
> 3. Social Theories
> 4. Social History

> Formal lectures on a great variety of subjects, such as Methods and Tactics of the Socialist Movement; Socialism and Art, History of the Labor Movement, Physical Evolution, and such special problems as those relating to Race Antagonisms, the Middle Class, Trade Unionism, Child and Woman Labor, Old Age Pensions, Immigration, Housing, Proletarian Diseases, and Labor Legislation.[43]

The above description of courses illustrates not only, the wide scope of Socialist intellectual interest, but also the ways in which Socialists wanted knowledge developed and applied to the solution of the social and physical problems of the masses. The emphasis on Social History and Labor History in the prospectus also contrasts dramatically with the absorption in political and military history that characterized the history programs of the established universities in the period. Charles A. Beard, at that time a young professor at Columbia was among the distinguished scholars associated with the Rand School as a history instructor. In a letter to the *Intercollegiate Socialist*, he wrote that men and women who claimed to be interested in the pursuit of knowledge could not ignore Socialism, a force which was undoubtedly shaking the old foundations of politics the world over, and whose theories were penetrating science, art and literature.

The efforts to establish a viable Socialist college in the Chicago area were less successful. In 1903, Ruskin College, which had originally been established in Trenton, Missouri by Walter Vrooman as an American branch of the Ruskin Hall movement of the English Socialists, moved to Glen Ellyn, Illinois. There it amalgamated with the Chicago Law School. An essential part of its work was the teaching of economics and sociology by Socialists, not precluding however, presentations from a capitalist viewpoint if they were thought to be useful. Charles Kerr wrote,

> I can unhesitatingly commend the school as one to which Socialist parents can send their sons and daughters from fourteen years up, with the assurance that their minds will not be perverted by the capitalistic atmosphere such as surrounds most colleges. It is also the best possible place for a young workingman who desires to get a broad education while earning his living.[44]

Problems in the relationship between Ruskin and the Chicago Law School led to the demise of the former. Therefore, in 1904, A.M. and May Wood Simons who had formed the core of the faculty of Ruskin, announced plans for a new Socialist Institution

> offering an opportunity for thorough, scholarly, systematic study of sociological material, and where especial emphasis will be placed upon these phases of the subject which are of interest to the working class in their struggle for freedom.[45]

The Simonses maintained that the work of education in Socialism had become "too great to be any longer carried on without division of labor," and that special institutions for educational purposes were needed. They cited the example of the *New University* in Brussels which had been decided upon by a meeting of Belgian intellectuals in 1894. The suppression of Elisée Reclus, a distinguished philosopher and geographer by the secular Free University of Belgium, for his support of the Paris Commune had led Belgian Socialists to conclude, like American Socialists, that the established universities had come to represent vested interests more than the pursuit of ideas.[46]

The courses that were to be offered in the Socialist Institute in Chicago were American Industrial History, by A.M. Simons; Political Economy by May Wood Simons; Socialism by May Wood Simons; Biological Sociology by Ernest Untermann; and Anthropology by Professor Jerome H.

Raymond of the University of Chicago. In addition to these courses which were to be given during the day and which were to occupy the student's full time, evening lectures were also proposed. These, on European Capitals and their Social Significance, Industrial History and Social Psychology, were to be given, it was hoped by Jerome Raymond, James Minnick and George Herron, respectively.

A significant criticism (of the exploitation of student labor by unscrupulous, ambitious professors) was made by A.M. Simons in his description of the manner in which these courses would be conducted. The work was to be carried on as a "co-operative investigation" by faculty and students with frequent meetings for discussion, mutual criticism and planning. Also, Simons added,

> If thought to be of sufficient value by the class the results will be published. In all cases full credit will be given to all participating in the work. No "professor" will "grow great" on the work of others, as has so often been the case in our great capitalist universities.[47]

As sources for study the excellent library facilities of the Chicago vicinity were cited. The John Crerar Library had the best collection of Socialist and Trade Union publications in the United States, and contained the Henry Demarest Lloyd Collection on labor problems and monopoly. The Newberry Library, the Chicago Public Library, and the Illinois Historical Society Library were all strong in American History. Also available to the students was the private library of A.M. and May Wood Simons with its very complete collection of recent American and European works on Socialism.

The Socialist Institute was also to make ingenious use of materials, invaluable for studies in the social sciences, like the U.S. Census which

could be secured by application to local members of Congress. Simons, at this time editor of the *International Socialist Review*, had articles reprinted in that journal thus making some significant work inexpensively available to the students. Simons also contributed his own sociological research results. An example of this was the panphlet, *Packingtown*, an investigation of the conditions of the Chicago stockyards and meat-packing industry. Simons was also writing and using as reference material his series on American History for the Workers praised by Frederick Jackson Turner as "peculiarly effective" for their purpose. The Charles Kerr Publishing House also put out inexpensive editions of Socialist classics and other pamphlets useful to the student of Socialist economics and philosophy.

The Chicago Institute, unlike the Rand School, lacked a rich benefactor. In spite of the enthusiasm of its sponsors and lecturers (and their ingenious attempts to circumvent inadequate financing) it survived for only two years.

The Rand School continued for many years to offer an extensive range of courses of study to working men and women as well as to full time students. The Rand School also sponsored, and published the results of, research in the social sciences. Neither in the United States nor abroad, however, were the attempted Socialist institutions of higher education able to compete seriously as alternatives to the established universities and colleges. These had the advantages of substantial private and public endowments as well as their reputations and power as accredited granters of the certificates, degrees and diplomas which opened the doors to professional positions and prestige.

There is little doubt then that Socialists found the higher learning of the American college and university a very flawed process. Their

student bodies were recruited almost entirely from the upper and middle class. Those few representatives of the working class who did attend colleges were liable to be corrupted and spoiled by their contacts with bourgeois culture,and their inevitable acquisition of its values. Personal success, material advancement and a swift rise out of the working class to positions that ensured minimal contacts with industrial labor were the major objects of study. Moreover, the close connection between the university and the economic and political oligarchy directly discouraged the critical investigation of crucial social, economic, even historical problems. For the Socialists higher education could no more be divorced from their philosophy of social morality than could progressive theory in the elementary school. Learning meant much more than the production of doctors, scientists, engineers. It had to include the co-ordination of these special branches of knowledge with the social duty of advancing the welfare, enlightenment and cultural involvement of the masses.

NOTES

Chapter VII

1. Robert Rives La Monte, "The New Intellectuals", *New Review* (January 1914): 45.
2. T.J. Maxwell, "News and Views", *International Socialist Review* 9 (June 1909): 1014.
3. Carl D. Thompson, "Who constitutes the Proletariat", *International Socialist Review* 9 (February 1909): 610.
4. Barnet G. Braverman, "College Proletarians", *The Masses*, March 1912.
5. Henry Flury, "College Men and Socialism", *International Socialist Review* 9 (August 1908): 133.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
7. Victor L. Berger, "Education and the Masses", *The Masses*, March 1912.
8. Editorial, *The Call*, 5 December 1909.
9. Charles Dobbs, "Brains", *International Socialist Review* 8 (March 1908): 533.
10. Robert Rives La Monte, "News and Views", *International Socialist Review* 8 (April 1908): 634.
11. Victor L. Berger, "Education and the Masses", *The Masses*, March 1912.
12. A.M. Simons, "Editorial", *International Socialist Review* 4 (January 1904): 430-31.
13. William D. Haywood, "News and Views", *International Socialist Review* 11 (June 1910): 1096.
14. Robert Rives La Monte, "News and Views", *International Socialist Review* 8 (April 1908): 635-36.

15. Hubert Lagardelle, "The Intellectuals and Working Class Socialism," Translated by Charles Kerr. *International Socialist Review* 8 (July 1907):39.
16. *Coming Nation*, 14 October 1911, p. 16.
17. Charles Edward Russell, "Are the Universities Instruments of Evil," *Coming Nation*, 7 January 1911, p. 2-4.
18. Editorial, *Appeal to Reason*, 9 December 1911.
19. William Brown, "Plutocracy or Democracy," *International Socialist Review* 1 (July 1900):9.
20. A.M. Simons, "The Ignorance of the Schools," *International Socialist Review* 4 (September 1903):176.
21. Henry Leffman, "Capitalistic Control of Education," *International Socialist Review* 9 (July 1908):26.
22. Adam Israeli, "Capitalistic Science," *International Socialist Review* 8 (October 1907):225-27.
23. Henry Leffman, "Capitalistic Control of Education," *International Socialist Review* 9 (July 1908):32-34.
24. William Rainey Harper, as quoted in Chester Destler, *Henry Demarest Lloyd, and the Empire of Reform* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963), p. 368.
25. *Appeal to Reason*, 24 April 1909.
26. As quoted in Howard H. Quint, *The Forging of American Socialism*, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1953) p. 133.
27. A.M. Simons, "Capitalism in the Universities," *International Socialist Review* 1 (April 1901):667.
28. *Appeal to Reason*, 28 April 1911.

29. Arthur Wallace Calhoun, "Academic Slavery " *New Review* (February 1914): 95-97.

30. Quoted in Scott Nearing, *The Making of a Radical*, (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1972), p. 83.

31. *Ibid.* p. 56.

32. *Ibid.* p. 94.

33. *Appeal to Reason*, 9 September 1911.

34. Editorial, *Coming Nation*, 13 March 1913, p. 4.

35. *Appeal to Reason*, 4 March 1911.

36. *Appeal to Reason*, 20 April 1912.

37. Ernest Poole, "The Intercollegiate Socialist," *Coming Nation*, 13 April 1912, p. 8.

38. *Appeal to Reason*, 8 May 1909.

39. Frank Bohn, "A University Hunger Strike," *The Masses*, May 1914.

40. *Appeal to Reason*, 11 November 1911.

41. Harlow Gale, "The Relation of Instructor and Student," Reprinted from Minnesota Magazine. *International Socialist Review* 1 (February 1901):490-92.

42. A.M. Simons and May Wood Simons, "Plans for a Study Class in Sociology," *International Socialist Review* 4 (May 1904):760.

43. "The New Socialist Review School," *International Socialist Review* 4 (June 1904):742-43.

44. Charles Kerr, "The Real Facts about Ruskin College," *International Socialist Review* 4 (September 1903):192.

45. A.M. Simons and May Wood Simons, "Plans for a Study Class in Sociology," *International Socialist Review* 4 (May 1904):760-61.

46. Odon Por, "The New University at Brussels," *International Socialist Review* 7 (August 1906):212.

47. A.M. Simons, "Investigation and Education for Socialists," *International Socialist Review* 5 (August 1904):112-13.

Chapter VIII

CONCLUSION: THE FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS AND PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALIST EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT 1900 TO 1920

Three major characteristics may be discerned in Socialist educational thought in the period from 1900 to 1920. One is the attempt to describe an educational ideal which would be implemented in the Socialist society which Socialists believed then, would emerge very soon from the inevitable break-down and failure of the capitalist system in America.

A second characteristic is evident in the arguments for immediate reforms and adaptations of the existing system of education so that its benefits would be extended to the children of the working classes. It is here that Socialist educational thought approximates closely that of other reformers like the Progressives. It should be emphasized, however, that equality of educational opportunity was not substituted by Socialists for the radical changes in organization and curriculum which formed the basis of their educational ideology. Other groups which have been identified as underprivileged or oppressed, in these later decades of the twentieth century, were also included in Socialist concern during this period. This is particularly true of the cause of women's rights, where equality in education and the teaching profession were enthusiastically advocated by almost all Socialists, including an articulate group of women in the movement. The right of women to continue teaching after marriage was a cause that Socialists resolutely endorsed, for example. On the other hand, the educational plight of black people was seen within the context of the class struggle and

there are few indications that it was perceived as being connected with race rather than economic status. However, a series of articles on black Americans by the Socialist historian, I.M. Robbins, included one on their education which discussed the disagreement between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois. Robbins' conclusion, in line with general Socialist educational philosophy supported the position of DuBois and deplored the exclusive emphasis given by Washington to manual skill training for black people.

The third major characteristic is the emphasis given in Socialist educational thought to the study of the social sciences - economics, sociology, history and anthropology. Socialists were also enthusiastic supporters of the inclusion of physical and natural sciences in the curriculum of the schools and colleges. Their views on the place of industrial and domestic arts were more complex. Socialists were insistent that such education be sponsored by public authorities, be a part of the curriculum in <u>all</u> schools, in order that it not become a system of class education reserved for the training of working class children, and that it ought never to be an end in itself, substituted for general education in academic subjects.

The educational ideals which Socialists hoped to see realized were intimately related to their perception of what constituted the good society. Here Socialist educational writers challenged their fellow citizens, educators in particular, to think out the implications of those terms, freedom and equality, which were the core values of the American nation. Socialists believed that these values, born in the humanistic and rational atmosphere of the eighteenth century needed rigorous re-interpretation

following the upheavals of the Industrial Revolution which had transformed economic and, therefore, social relationships. Freedom and equality as values were considered worthy, indeed central to Socialists as societal goals, but the transfer of all significant economic resources to the control of the few had created a situation of gross inequality and as a consequence a condition of de facto servitude for the masses. Such an economic situation nullified the democratic promise of American life and involved the schools in a constant contradiction between their expressed democratic goals and the capitalist realities to which teacher, parent, and student were subject.

The Socialists located their goals in human history, in the development and enhancement of human happiness and fulfillment. Even the pre-modern Socialism of the communitarians exhibited a concern, unusual at the time, for the welfare of every individual in the community, from cradle to grave. The central idea of Socialist educational theory was the completest possible development of the individual in every aspect of his being. This can be seen as a constant in the Socialist tradition in educational thought, in Marx's objection to the alienation of the laborer from the fruits of his labor, in the Perfectionists' system of job rotation, in the American Socialist Party's disapproval of an exclusive emphasis upon industrial education. It derived, of course, partly from the Socialist belief that the twentieth century should see the dawning of the day of the common man, and that the traditional relegation of a whole class to the performance of the arduous, often dirty and unpleasant but necessary labor of society must end. Slavery and serfdom had been abolished. "Wage

slavery" must be next. It was with an old radical question that Socialists challenged the educational system.

When Adam delved, and Eve span

Who was then the gentleman?

Some Socialists looked forward to the solution of the problem of who should perform the onerous tasks of society in the application of technology. More realistically, and with perhaps greater insight into psychological needs, most American Socialists embraced another education-work philosophy.

These Socialists believed that, with the removal of the profit-motive in society, an integration of learning, work, art and service to the community could be brought about. This view was an interesting contrast to the Puritan work ethic although not completely opposed to its view of some work as duty. Paradoxically, the Socialist ideal more closely resembled the aristocratic concept of work as pleasure and pastime. It was here that the Socialists found themselves at one with the theorists of progressive education. The Socialist admiration of and support for, Dewey's educational philosophy has been discussed as well as Floyd Dell's espousal of the programs of the Association for the Advancement of Progressive Education. In a truly democratic society, Socialists envisaged no abrupt separation between education, work and pleasure. The conditions under which choices could be made about occupation, familiar to the upper classes but a luxury unattainable by the industrial laborers, should be made possible for all. The drudgery of factory, mine, field and office would be abolished by changing both the physical and moral conditions of the work performed

there. Since in a Socialist community, economic enterprises would be controlled by the people for the people's benefit, the conditions under which people worked would be arranged with their welfare as the dominant concern rather than the maximization of profit. The construction and maintenance of plants, hours of work, facilities for study, cultural activities, recreation would all reflect this priority. However important the achievement of these improved material conditions might be, this would be less vital than the spirit of co-operation and public service which the achievement of economic democracy, that is Socialism, would release and foster. This is why Socialists appreciated the educational possibilities for Socialism of Dewey's educational philosophy with its emphasis on self-direction, co-operation with others in the solution of problems, and its encouragement of the experimental spirit. If the masses were to be proficient in the control of their economy, their politics, their lives, the habits of subservience, and passivity resulting from the traditional system of education, particularly as it operated among the lower classes, had to be replaced. As Socialists saw it, the factory-like atmosphere of the common school descendant of the Lancasterian classroom with its regimentation and hierarchies of authority was admirably suited to the production of proletarian operatives with just enough mental skills to run the machinery efficiently. Instead, Socialist educators wanted an education that would make free, active, intelligent citizens of all. And this aim, they reiterated was after all the stated goal of the American School. If, after the reformation of the conditions and meaning of industrial and agricultural activity there remained undesirable tasks which were essential to productivity and the maintenance of civil life, it was

understood, as suggested by Bellamy, that these were either rewarded by some special privileges, or preferably performed by volunteers as a public service. The point was that industrial productivity, as examplified by the factory particularly, should be the responsibility and interest of all.

In regard to these most basic principles of Socialist educational thought, and since Socialists have never come to achieve power in the United States, it is interesting to reflect upon the lines which educational policies took in the Soviet Union and are taking in the People's Republic of China. The first decade after the Russian Revolution saw the triumph of Dewey's educational ideas in the class room. Non-authoritarian methodologies, the dethronement of the teacher, the de-emphasis upon grades and examinations, and the encouragement of initiative and experimentation were the characteristics of Soviet education in this era. In the 1930's however, the situation reversed. Dewey's philosophy was vilified and Soviet educational practice extolled the central role of the teacher as instructor, the importance of mastering prescribed bodies of subject matter, passing examinations, and the selection of an elite for specialized studies in the university. The rejection of the Socialist democratic ideal in education might be compared with the triumph of the authoritarian bureaucracy in the state.

In China, on the other hand, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution which began in 1966 at Peking University opened with a challenge to educational institutions to reject the accelerating return to traditionalism and authoritarianism with their de facto exclusion of the children of workers and peasants. The Cultural Revolution, so far, has

reasserted the importance of realizing Socialist goals. Students and teachers are sharing in the tasks of production by working in the fields and factories alongside peasants and workers. Studies in the schools and universities are being more closely co-ordinated with efforts to serve the masses of the people. For instance, the training of bare-foot doctors, medical aides who are to go out to remote villages to administer medicine, perform minor operations and advance public health, is promoted vigorously. Experimenting upon themselves to find new uses and sites for the application of acupuncture in performing operations and cures is also reported. Many of the educational ideas that have been put into practice during the Cultural Revolution seem like the incarnation of Dewey's philosophy, and perhaps illustrate the impossibility of its execution in any but a Socialist environment. This was, of course, the central contradiction facing the American Socialists - the difficulty of introducing Socialist values and goals into an educational system which in fact served the perpetuation of values like "getting ahead", competitiveness, and the achievement of individual success.

Where Socialist educators called for adjustments in the educational system that would open it up to the children of all classes they met with a wider sympathy. The exposures by the Socialists Robert Hunter and John Spargo, in *Hunger* and *The Bitter Cry of the Children* led to some attempts to provide school meals and medical attention. The *International Socialist Review* reported in 1910 that even the Republicans, in the Busse administration of Chicago had begun to supply penny lunches to children. The demands for these services as a minimal effort

to enable the children of the economically deprived to benefit from the provision of public education were the regular features of both national and municipal Socialist campaign platforms, in the period from 1900 to 1920. The sanguine prophecy of Grace Potter in 1913 that

> within two years arrangements for providing warm meals, dinner or lunch, if not breakfast, for school children will be under way in all large American cities and the most progressive rural districts.[1]

has yet to be realized. The recent efforts of the Black Panthers, for example, to provide breakfasts for poor black children illustrates the far from complete acceptance of the principle advocated by Socialists half a century ago that supportive services had to be assumed by the community to make educational opportunities a reality for the children of the poor.

In connection with the process of learning itself, Socialists demanded that school supplies and text books be given free to all students. There were also suggestions that pensions be paid to impoverished parents so that all children could stay at school as long as they wished notwithstanding the need of their families for the contribution of their wages. Socialists also believed that "a complete educational ladder for all children from kindergarten to doctorate without a penny of charge to the individual" should be provided. Another insistent demand and one which was immediately implemented in municipalities under Socialist control was for the fuller use of school buildings. This was a minor illustration of the Socialist belief in the integration of life, education, work and culture, as well as meeting the practical need of the working people

for meeting places and recreational facilities. Floyd Dell stated the case

> Let us get over the notion that school buildings are sacrosanct. We seem to regard with jealous pride the utter emptiness and uselessness of our school buildings after hours; it is a kind of ceremonial wastefulness which appeals to some deep-seated sense of religious taboo in us. We feel that it is a desecration to allow dances and political meetings to be held there.[2]

The imperfect realization of any of these reforms relating to education proposed by the Socialists of the early twentieth century indicates that, in spite of the sporadic sympathy they engendered, a sustained public policy in these areas has not been achieved. This is so in spite of the mounting evidence that good food and good health are vital ingredients of mental as well as educational growth. These supportive educational policies remain most relevant to the construction of a system which aspires to the goal of equal educational opportunity, at least.

The third major component of Socialist educational thought - which comprised the demand for a radical revision of the content of the curriculum - indicates Socialist awareness of the use of the modern educational system as a process of indoctrination in the values of the status quo. In the United States, as Socialists perceived it, this meant that an effective, if subtle, system of censorship prevented the presentation of viewpoints opposed to capitalist values. Socialists cited, as we have observed, the control of higher education by the same forces as controlled the great corporations, with the consequent suppression of criticism. Even at the level of the local school, the voice of the working class was inaudible and only the representatives

of business, and the middle class were on the school boards. Thus, in the area of the social studies particularly, there was a non-development of interpretations and even courses of study which would seriously challenge the capitalist view of society. A whole new generation was thus indoctrinated with the myths of the capitalist state and taught that salvation depended upon individual success and good fortune. George Herron wrote,

> It is interesting and easy to see the trade marks of capitalism all through our present public school instruction; to point out the subtle yet sure perversion of fact and of history; to record omissions of things once taught in the schools, and the addition of things not previously taught. We may also note the introduction of the military spirit and ideal into the public school; the instruction in, and insistence upon the child's reverence for patriotism - patriotism, the superstition which our masters impose upon us in order to keep the workers of the world divided against each other; patriotism which has come to be little more than greed with the flag over it.[3]

A non-Socialist discussion of the efforts by business to influence the curriculum may be found in S. Alexander Rippa's *Education in a Free Society*.[4]

In conclusion, Socialists agreed that until a Socialist state came into being their educational ideas could only be imperfectly implemented. Socialists were convinced that the vision of a society, encouraged by capitalist myth, where poverty would be non-existent and where every individual could realize his full potential could not be realized without a social and economic organization appropriate to its accomplishment. Socialism as a political movement has failed, so far, in the United States to gain the power to accomplish its ends. Nevertheless the Socialist educational ideals generated during the

first two decades of the twentieth century continue to have relevance to the American educational scene. Social class structure remains the most important single factor in educational deprivation and failure.[5] Supportive social services, remedial programs, economic assistance to poor students and their families remain grossly inadequate to achieve the goal of providing even for equal educational opportunity. The problems of alienation, evidenced among industrial workers in increasing sabotage, and among the business and professional classes and their offspring in the questioning of life styles, suggest the fruitfulness of the basic educational ideals that labor, intellect, art and service need to be integrated in the individual. And finally, the disorder and disintegration of civic and school life lend validity to the Socialist criticism that the encouragement of rampant individualism as a value cannot be substituted for the commitment to a healthy community life, organized along principles of just distribution.

NOTES

Chapter VIII

1. Grace Potter, "School Feeding: A Book Review", *New Review* (June 1913): 603.
2. Floyd Dell, *Were You Ever a Child?* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919), p. 24.
3. George Herron, "The Social Opportunity", *International Socialist Review* 4 (February 1904): 586.
4. S. Alexander Rippa, *Education in a Free Society* (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1967), pp. 265-82.
5. Christopher Jencks, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1972) documents the failure of, and inability of educational institutions to compensate for the disadvantages of being a member of the less privileged socio-economic classes in the United States in improving academic achievement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

I. BOOKS

Addams, Jane. *Democracy and Social Ethics*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1902.

Bellamy, Edward. *Looking Backward, 2000-1887*. New York: New American Library, 1960.

Bottomore, T.B. and Rubel, Maximilian, eds. *Karl Marx, Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*. London: Watts and Co., 1956.

Brisbane, Albert. *The Social Destiny of Man*. Philadelphia: C.F. Stollmeyer, 1840.

Caute, David, ed. *Essential Writings of Karl Marx*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1967.

DeLeon, Daniel. *Revolution or Reform*. New York: Pamphlet, 1943.

Dell, Floyd. *Were You Ever A Child?* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919.

Dewey, John. *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1910.

Engels, Frederick. *Introduction to the Dialectic of Nature*. Marx and Engels Selected Works. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1961.

Fourier, Charles. *Design for Utopia*, with an introduction by Charles Gide and translated by Julia Franklin. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Gronlund, Laurence. *The Co-operative Commonwealth*. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1884.

Hillquit, Morris. *Loose Leaves from a Busy Life*. New York: Rand School Press, 1934.

Hughan, Jessie Wallace. *American Socialism of the Present Day*. New York: John Lane Co., 1911.

La Monte, Robert Rives and H.L. Mencken. *Men versus the Man*, A Correspondence. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1910.

London, Jack. *Essays of Revolt*, ed. Leonard D. Abbott. New York: Vanguard Press, 1926.

London, Jack. *The Iron Heel*. New York: Bantam Books Edition, 1971.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Chicago: Charles Kerr and Co., 1906.

Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1961.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. *The German Ideology*, edited and with an introduction by R. Pascal. New York: International Publishers, 1939.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. *The Communist Manifesto*, ed. Francis B. Randall, trans. Samual Moore. New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1964.

Melvin, Floyd J. *Socialism as the Sociological Ideal*. New York: Sturgis and Walton Co., 1915.

Mills, Walter Thomas. *The Struggle for Existence*. Chicago: John F. Higgins, 1904.

Nearing, Scott. *The Making of a Radical*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1972.

Nearing, Scott. *The New Education: A Review of Progressive Education Movements of the Day*. Chicago: Row, Peterson and Co., 1915.

Nearing, Scott. *Social Adjustment*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1915.

Noyes, John Humphrey. *The Berean*. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Noyes, Pierrepont. *My Father's House, An Oneida Boyhood*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart Inc., 1937.

Owen, Robert. *A New View of Society*, A Facsimile Reproduction of the Third Edition printed in London in 1817. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Parton, Mary Field, ed. *Autobiography of Mother Jones*. Chicago: Charles Kerr and Co., 1972.

Sams, Henry W., ed. *Autobiography of Brook Farm*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Sears, John Van Der Zee. *My Friends at Brook Farm*. New York: Desmond Fitzgerald, 1912.

Spargo, John. *The Bitter Cry of the Children*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1913.

Triggs, Oscar Lovell. *The Changing Order*. Chicago: Charles Kerr and Co., 1913.

Walling, William English. *The Larger Aspects of Socialism*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1913.

Walling, William English; Phelps Stokes, J.G.; Hughan, Jessie Wallace; Laidler, Harry W.; and other members of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. *The Socialism of Today*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1916.

II. ARTICLES

Abbott, Leonard, "A Latter Day Brook Farm." *International Socialist Review* 1 (May 1901):700-705.

Allen, Carrie W. "Child Slaves of the Cotton Mill." *International Socialist Review* 11 (January 1910):521-23.

Andrews, E.F. "The Monopoly of Intellect." *International Socialist Review* 1 (June 1901):765-68.

Bellamy, Edward. "Looking Backward Again." *North American Review*, 150, 1890, pp. 362-63.

Berger, Victor. "Education and the Masses." *The Masses*, March 1912.

Bohn, Frank. "A University Hunger Strike." *The Masses*, May 1914.

Bohn, William. "What Kind of Education?" *The New Review*, April 1916, pp. 113-15.

Boudin, Louis. "The Concentration of Capital and the Disappearance of the Middle Class." *International Socialist Review* 7 (August 1906): 73-90.

Braverman, Barnet G. "College Proletarians." *The Masses*, March 1912.

Brown, William. "Plutocracy or Democracy." *International Socialist Review* 1 (July 1900):1-16.

Calhoun, Arthur W. "Academic Slavery." *The New Review*, February 1914, pp. 95-97.

Calhoun, Arthur. "Schools for Democracy." *The Masses*, May 1912.

Cohen, Joseph. "Socialism for Students." *International Socialist Review* 9 (June 1909):965-74.

"Consideration of the Literacy Test for the Restriction of Immigration." *The New Review*, March 1913, pp. 376-81.

Dobbs, Charles. "Brains." *International Socialist Review* 8 (March 1908): 533-37.

Eastman, Max. "Editorial." *The Masses*, December 1913.

Eastman, Max. *Address to the Jury in the Second Masses Trial.* New York: 1919.

Flury, Henry. "College Men and Socialism." *International Socialist Review* 9 (August 1908):131-34.

Gale, Harlow. "The Relation of Instructor and Student." Reprinted from the Minnesota Magazine. *International Socialist Review* 1 (February 1901):486-92.

Grendon, Felix. "Children's Rights." *The New Review*, February 1916, pp. 87-96.

Grendon, Felix. "Letter to the Editor." *The New Review*, May 1915, pp. 45-46.

Haywood, William. "News and Views." *International Socialist Review* 11 (June 1910):1096.

Herron, George. "Socialism and Religion." *International Socialist Review* 1 (January 1901):433-37.

Herron, George. "The Social Opportunity." *International Socialist Review* 4 (February 1904):577-96.

Israeli, Adam. "Capitalistic Science." *International Socialist Review* 8 (October 1907):220-27.

Kerr, Charles. "Trade Union Support for Socialist Journals." *International Socialist Review* 8(December 1907):343.

Kerr, Charles. "The Real Facts about Ruskin College." *International Socialist Review* 4 (September 1903):192.

Kotsch, Georgia. "News and Views." *International Socialist Review* 9 (April 1909):819.

Lagardelle, Hubert. "The Intellectuals and Working Class Socialism." *International Socialist Review* 8 (July 1901):31-41.

La Monte, Robert Rives. "The New Intellectuals." *The New Review*, January 1914, pp. 45-53.

La Monte, Robert Rives. "News and Views." *International Socialist Review* 8 (April 1908):634-37.

Leffman, Henry. "Capitalistic Control of Education." *International Socialist Review* 9 (July 1908):26-33.

Lewis, Arthur M. "Benjamin Kidd's Religious Interpretation of History." *International Socialist Review* 8 (February 1908):474-76.

Lewis, Austin. "Socialism and Education." *International Socialist Review* 9 (November 1908):375-80.

Mann, Horace. "The Ideals and Shortcomings of Society." *International Socialist Review* 3 (January 1904):470-75.

Mason, Walt. "Fool Knowledge." *Appeal to Reason*, 23 October 1911.

Maxwell, T.J. "News and Views." *International Socialist Review* 9 (June 1909):1013-15.

Meily, Clarence. "Why the Working Man is without a Church." *International Socialist Review* 7 (January 1907):459-61.

Poole, Ernest. "The Intercollegiate Socialist." *Coming Nation*, 13 April 1912, pp. 8-10.

Por, Odon. "The New University at Brussels." *International Socialist Review* 7 (October 1906):209-20.

Potter, Grace. "School Feeding: A Book Review." *The New Review*, June 1913, pp. 603-607.

"Review of S.E. Forman's 'Living among the Poor'", *International Socialist Review*, 1 (June 1907):717-18.

Russell, Charles Edward. "Are the Universities Instruments of Evil?" *Coming Nation*, 7 January 1911, pp. 2-4.

Simons, A.M. "Capitalism in the Universities." *International Socialist Review* 1 (April 1901):666-68.

Simons, A.M. "Editorial." *International Socialist Review* 1 (November 1900): 316-20.

Simons, A.M. "Editorial." *International Socialist Review* 4 (January 1904): 430-31.

Simons, A.M. "Ignorance of the Schools." *International Socialist Review* 4 (September 1903):174-78.

Simons, A.M. "Investigation and Education for Socialists." *International Socialist Review* 5 (August 1904):112-13.

Simons, A.M. and May Wood. "Plans for a Study Class in Sociology." *International Socialist Review* 4 (May 1904):760-64.

Simons, May Wood. "Education and Democracy." *International Socialist Review* 3 (January 1902):90-96.

Simons, May Wood. "Education and Socialism." *International Socialist Review*, 1 (April 1901):600-605.

Simons, May Wood. "Building a New School System." *Coming Nation*, 10 June 1911, pp. 3-4.

Sombart, Werner. "A Study of the Historical Development of the American Proletariat." *International Socialist Review* 7 (September 1905): 129-36, (November 1905):293-301, (December 1905):358-67.

Thompson, Carl D. "Who Constitutes the Proletariat?" *International Socialist Review* 9 (February 1909):603-12.

Walling, William English. "Letter to the Editor." *The New Review*, 15 April 1915, pp. 221-23.

"Editorial." *Appeal to Reason*, 31 July 1909.

"Editorial." *Appeal to Reason*, 14 August 1909.

"Editorial." *Appeal to Reason*, 9 December 1911.

"Editorial." *The Call*, 5 December 1909.

"Editorial." *Coming Nation*, 13 March 1913.

"Editorial." *The Masses*, December 1913.

Appeal to Reason, 24 April 1909.

Appeal to Reason, 8 May 1909.

Appeal to Reason, 4 March 1911.

Appeal to Reason, 28 April 1911.

Appeal to Reason, 9 September 1911.

Appeal to Reason, 11 November 1911.

Appeal to Reason, 20 April 1912.

Coming Nation, 14 October 1911.

SECONDARY SOURCES

I. BOOKS

Aaron, Daniel. *Writers on the Left.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961.

Armytage, W.H.G. *Heavens Below.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

Bestor, Arthur Eugene Jr. *Backwoods Utopias.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950.

Boudin, Louis. *The Theoretical System of Karl Marx.* Chicago: Charles Kerr and Co., 1915.

Bowers, C.A. *The Progressive Educators and the Depression.* New York: Random House, 1969.

Callahan, Raymond E. *An Introduction to Education in American Society.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Cantor, Milton. *Max Eastman.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970.

Destler, Chester. *Henry Demarest Lloyd and the Empire of Reform.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963.

Dickens, Charles. *American Notes for General Circulation.* London: Everyman's, 1907.

Douglas, Paul. *American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education.* New York: Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, 1921.

Egbert, Donald Drew and Persons, Stow, eds. *Socialism and American Life.* Vols. 1 and 2. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Edwards, Jonathan. *Works of President Edwards.* Vol. 2. New York: Leavitt, Trow and Co., 1844.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Complete Works.* Vol. 2, edited by E.W. Emerson. Centenary Edition. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1903.

Flory, Claud R. *Economic Criticism in American Fiction.* New York: Russell and Russell, 1937.

Fraser, Stewart E. *Education and Communism in China.* Hong Kong: International Studies Group, 1969.

Freedman, Robert. *Marxist Social Thought.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.

Fried, Albert. *Socumentary History of American Socialism.* New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Harrington, Michael. *Socialism.* New York: Saturday Review Press, 1970.

Harris, David. *Socialist Origins in the United States.* The Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Co., 1966.

Hofstadter, Richard M. *Social Darwinism in American Thought.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

Hawthrone, Nathaniel. "The Shaker Bridal", Vol. 1, pp. 469-766 of *Complete Works;* and "The Canterbury Pilgrims", Vol. 3, pp. 518-30 of *Complete Works.* Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1882.

Holloway, Mark. *Heavens on Earth.* New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1966.

Hook, Sidney. *Marx and the Marxists.* Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand and Co., Inc., 1955.

Hu, Chang-Tu, ed. *Chinese Education under Communism.* New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1962.

Jencks, Christopher, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America.* New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Johnson, Oakley C. *Robert Owen in the United States.* New York: Humanities Press, 1970.

Kipnis, Ira. *The American Socialist Movement.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Kreuter, Kent and Gretchen. *An American Dissenter. The Life of Algie Martin Simons 1870-1950.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1969.

Lasch, Christopher. *The Agony of the American Left.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Maclure, William. *Education and Reform at New Harmony; Correspondence of William Maclure and Marie Duclos Fretageot.* Edited by Arthur E. Bestor, Jr. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1948.

Martineau, Harriet. *Society in America.* Vol. 2. New York: Saunders and Otley, 1837.

Mills, C. Wright. *The Marxists.* Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1962.

Nee, Victor. *The Cultural Revolution at Peking University.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969.

Nordhoff, Charles. *The Communistic Societies of the United States.* New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Noyes, John Humphrey. *History of American Socialisms* with a new introduction by Mark Holloway. New York: Dover Publications, 1966.

Parrington, Vernon Louis. *American Dreams.* New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1964.

Parton, Mary Field, ed. *Autobiography of Mother Jones*. Chicago: Charles Kerr and Co., 1972.

Quint, Howard H. *The Forging of American Socialism*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1953.

Rideout, Walter B. *The Radical Novel in the United States 1900-1954*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1956.

Rippa, S. Alexander. *Education in a Free Society*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1967.

Rippa, S. Alexander, ed. *Educational Ideas in America: A Documentary History*. New York: David McKay Co., 1969.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University*. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Shannon, David A. *The Socialist Party of America*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1955.

Slesinger, Zalmen. *Education and the Class Struggle*. New York: Covici Friede, 1937.

Stetler, Henry Gruber. *The Socialist Movement in Reading, Pennsylvania, 1896-1936*. Storrs, Connecticut, 1943.

Tawney, Richard H. *The Radical Tradition*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1964.

Weinstein, James. *The Decline of Socialism, 1912-1925*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967.

Winthrop, John. *Life and Letters of John Winthrop* by Robert C. Winthrop. Vol. 2. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1869.

Yorburg, Betty. *Utopia and Reality, A Collective Portrait of American Socialists*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

II. ARTICLES

Sadler, Elizabeth. "One Book's Influence." *New England Quarterly* 17 (December 1944):530-55.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE ACTIVITY OF LOCAL SOCIALIST ADMINISTRATIONS WHILE THE SOCIALIST PARTY IS A MINORITY PARTY

PREAMBLE FOR MUNICIPAL PROGRAM

Socialist representatives in municipal administrations should always bear clearly in mind the scientific basis of the Socialist Municipal Program. Under capitalism the municipalization of public enterprises has been compelled in the interest of the business man. The graft of a few has come to interfere with the graft of the remainder of the business world, on account of the development of machinery vital to municipal life. There has followed as a result of this what might be called municipal capitalism, which would operate these publicly owned industries for the purpose of reducing the taxes of present property holders.

It must be borne in mind that Socialism will operate these enterprises in one of the three following ways:

First. All service absolutely free of cost to the public, paid for out of the general fund. Instance, the roads and streets, police service, and the free water supply of New Orleans.

Second. Service at cost of production. Instance, the usual theory of water supply, and of the United States Postoffice.

Third. Service furnished at a profit to the municipality, the profits to be used for the benefit of the whole community. Instance, the taking of water works profits for the perfection of fire department and extension of parks, bath and play-ground systems.

All other measures are to be considered in the light of their bearing upon the working class as such. Those which will prepare the working people for their part in the class struggle by increase of intelligence, strengthening of their bodies, securing independence or certainty of livelihood for them, are to be considered as so many weapons making for their victory. On the other hand, the taking away from the capitalist class of exclusive privileges, making the courts free to all and securing, as far as possible, the limitation of those powers financial, legal, social and political which have accumulated in the hands of the capitalist class will tend, of course, to make the victory of the working class more easy at every step.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

I. Changes in Instruction

1. Sufficient kindergartens for all children of proper age.
2. Manual training (not trade schools) in all grades.
3. General introduction of idea of development and freedom in education with close connection with things, according to principles of modern pedagogy.

4. Teaching of economics and history with evolution of industry as base.
5. Establishment of vacation schools.
6. Adequate night schools for adults.
7. Instruction of children as to child labor legislation and rights of children before the law.

II. Changes Affecting Teaching Force

1. Adequate number of teachers (small classes in all schools).
2. Normal school training required as minimum qualification for teaching.
3. Right of trial for teachers before dismissal.
4. Pensions for teachers when superannuated or disabled.

III. Care of Children

1. Uniform free text-books for all schools, public and private, on demand.
2. Free meals and clothing.
3. Free medical service, inspection for eyes, ears, mental faculties (for educational purposes), and for contagion.

IV. Equipment

1. Adequate buildings, numerous, not too large.
2. Ample play-grounds, with physical instructor in charge.
3. Museums, art galleries, libraries, etc., enlarged and accessible to all children through frequent visits accompanied by teachers.
4. Baths and gymnasiums in each school.
5. All school buildings open evenings, Sundays and holidays for public assemblages.

APPENDIX B

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AT THE CONGRESS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY, 1912

The subject of vocational education and guidance has aroused great interest among American Socialists. It will be seen that the reports of the committees make definite recommendations for industrial education, but that the discussion brings out decided opposition to vocational training as at present existing, on the ground that it serves merely to make boys and girls "more efficient servants to a master class."

We take the following from the report on vocational education:

> The demand for quick profits, on the one hand, and the necessity for maximum family earnings on the other, have between them done much to destroy the apprenticeship possibilities of modern industry.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The result has been that more than half of the young people who leave the schools at about the age of fourteen drift into occupations which have absolutely no future for them except to continue to work as men and women at wages that can be earned by boys and girls.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Without prejudice to the education of those who are to become professional or agricultural or commericial workers, the schools should fit those whose occupations will be found in the industries. Without loss of those elements in our culture that is the rightful heritage of every boy and girl, each child should have the same opportunity to become an efficient worker as is now given to the four percent who become professional workers.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It therefore devolves upon the public school to modify and to extend its program to include training for vocational efficiency. It is only the public school that can protect the interests of the children of the public as well as advance those interests.
>
> In this connection attention should be called to a system of part-time schools which is being tried experimentally at many points. . . . These experiments should be watched with interest, as they must be very instructive as to methods of conducting industrial education; but they are not likely to be entirely satisfactory, since under some of the arrangements the employer determines what boys are or are not to have an opportunity to learn the trade, while under all the plans the employer is in a position to direct the work of the school too much. The employers must not be allowed to control the schools for their advantage any more than a trade-union may be allowed to restrict opportunities of workers to its advantage.
>
> The public schools that have introduced industrial courses with a view to giving industrial education independent of commercial shops are likely to be handicapped at first and for some time to come, by the lack of suitable equipment and by the impossibility of obtaining suitable teachers in sufficient numbers. But eventually this type of

school will probably be the most satisfactory. A temporary device that will have to serve for many years is the continuation school, whether day or evening. . . .

Evening schools should be avoided for young people, as far as possible. The amount of work required of them in shops and opportunity to attend school without detriment to their health and physical development.

. . . . . .

The following discussion illustrated the point of view of those Socialists who are opposed to the present system of trade education.

Delegate Slobodin (New York): There is one point on which we are all clear in regard to this question of vocational training, and that is that as Socialists we are opposed to the present system of trade education. The industrial education which the Socialist desires is different from the industrial education which the capitalists desire. There is often confusion between training for a trade and scientific industrial training. How can a Socialist at this time stand for training for a trade merely?

. . . . . .

You see those who advocate the education of the boy or girl for a mere trade are not advocating what we are striving for. Your boy or girl should be trained in mechanics; the knowledge of general mechanics and the use of tools. The young man or young woman who possesses a knowledge of mechanics and knows how to use tools, can go into trades, and can acquire a new trade very easily, and can adapt themselves to almost any trade within certain limits.

That is the first thing, then: broad industrial training, and not merely training for one trade.

The second important point is control of the vocational and industrial schools by the working-class, not by the public, as our reporters want to say. . . .

Delegate Cliffors (Ohio): I desire to speak in opposition to this entire report. I do not agree with the comrades here that this Convention should go on record simply as demanding industrial education for our boys and girls. I do not wish as a member of the Socialist Party, to go on record through our Convention as favoring the training of our boys and girls merely for the purpose of making them more efficient servants to a master class.

I want them to have the highest industrial education. But it is practically useless for us even to demand that until we get control of our public school system. When we have done that we can put into operation any policy that we see fit, but in the meantime all of this matter should be simmered down to the one main demand; for the industrial education of the boys and girls of the working-class, and let it go at that.

As a consequence of these and other similar criticisms, the above report was not adopted, but was referred to a new standing committee for report at the next convention (1916).